

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of Milwaukee (Wis.) Lodge, No. 234, International Association of Machinists, favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Wisconsin Live Stock Breeders' Association, Madison, Wis., concerning licensing of dogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAGO: Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against Congress taking any action to suspend the game laws of the several States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of maritime committee of the Chamber of Commerce of Baltimore, Md., favoring passage of House bill 7913, relative to betterment of Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE of Vermont: Petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society, Gleasons Sunday-school Class of the Methodist Church, and the local Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Bellows Falls, Vt., favoring national prohibition during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring the Overman bill, Senate bill 3771; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Thomas W. Bicknell, founder of the Society of the Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims, for repeal of the periodical postal amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Central Bureau Furniture and Casket Manufacturers, opposing House bill 7353, for employment of convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of National Live Stock Shippers' Protective League, favoring leaving rate-fixing power with Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, of Chelsea, Mass., against increase in second-class mailing rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Resolutions adopted by the Travelers' Club of Newark, N. J.; Progress Club of Nevada, Mo.; the Santa Fe (N. Mex.) Woman's Club; Springfield (Mo.) Council of National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations; the Woman's Club of San Angelo, Tex.; Elective Study Club of Minneapolis, Minn.; the Woman's Club of Granby, Mass.; Arkansas Press Association; and the New Mexico Federation of Women's Clubs, protesting against the zone system of periodical postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Memorial of City Council of Erie, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 7995, relative to care, etc., of flagship *Niagara* used in Battle of Lake Erie; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REED: Evidence to accompany House bill 10328 for pension for Herbert B. Holloway; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs, relative to the establishment of a zone system on magazine publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions of Adult Bible Class, Protestant Methodist Church, and citizens of New Castle, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of carriers of Bridgeport and Meriden (Conn.) post offices, favoring H. R. 9414, a bill to increase salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VESTAL: Petition of citizens of Adams County, Ind., favoring prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Wells County, Ind., concerning food production and conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 1, 1918.

Rev. William F. McDowell, of the city of Washington, bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, offered the following prayer: Almighty God, do Thou control our minds and hold our hearts in Thy hand. Direct our deliberations for the highest good of the country and the greatest good of mankind; and grant Thy blessing to the Government of the United States and to our allies in this great struggle. In the name of the Lord we ask it. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, requests a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereof, and had appointed Mr. SIMS, Mr. DOREMUS, and Mr. ESCH managers at the conference on the part of the House.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. McNARY (for Mr. CHAMBERLAIN) presented a petition of the Marion Lawrence Bible Class, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of Salem, Oreg., praying for the closing of all breweries and saloons for the period of the war, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Local Branch, Massachusetts State Federation of Woman's Clubs, of Wollaston, Mass., praying for the repeal of the present postage rate on second-class mail matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. KNOX presented memorials of sundry citizens of Altoona, Pa., remonstrating against the placing of railroad tracks directly opposite the Lucy Webb Hayes Training School and the Sibley Memorial Hospital, in the city of Washington, D. C., which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made providing for the deepening of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the Atlantic Ocean, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the Chartiers Presbyterian Church, of Canonsburg, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge, No. 735, International Association of Machinists, of Beaver Falls; of Local Lodge, No. 798, International Association of Machinists, of Butler; and of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of the Woman's Kansas Day Club, of Topeka, Kans., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of Topeka, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect the United States flag from misuse or desecration, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PNEUMATIC-TUBE MAIL SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 191).

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to present at this time the report of the joint commission appointed by the two Houses to investigate the pneumatic-tube situation. It is a very short report.

I desire to state for the information of the Senate that there will be quite an amount of additional matter to accompany the report. This additional matter consists of reports of the engineers and their findings and conclusions, reports of accountants who have carefully gone through the books of the pneumatic-tube service companies, and other publications that appear to be essential so that the Senate may have full and complete information.

I make this report to-day, Mr. President, because under the resolution authorizing the appointment of the commission they were required to report not later than to-day.

I wish to state that one member of the commission on the part of the House will file a minority report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the report will be printed.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

A bill (S. 3994) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize condemnation proceedings of lands for military purposes," approved July 2, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 3995) to amend section 224 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to certificates of discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 3996) granting an increase of pension to George L. Jaquith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 3997) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty," approved January 21, 1914; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 3998) granting an increase of pension to William H. Young (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3999) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo L. Whitcomb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 4000) to authorize corporations organized in the District of Columbia to change their names; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 4001) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings; and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 4002) granting a pension to William L. Martin; and  
A bill (S. 4003) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Lackady; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 4004) granting an increase of pension to Dwight Simpson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 134) to reimburse soldiers and officers for uniforms and equipment lost on board the *Tuscania* February 5, 1918, and in other like cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### AMENDMENT TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment providing for the appointment of a messenger for the minority, at \$1,440 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, etc., appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### RAILROAD CONTROL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives insisting upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. TOWNSEND conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed, and the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business. Senate bill 3714.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am not one of those who think that war ends legislative responsibility. I believe that when the House of Representatives and the Senate have given their best thought to legislation it is more certain to be wise and helpful than when bills are passed simply because they are the work of those connected with administrative branches of the Government. Entertaining these firmly fixed views, and endeavoring at all times to live up to them, I wish to express an earnest appreciation of the splendid work done by the Secretary of the Treasury and those who aided him in the

preparation of this bill. I believe that it will prove a great contribution to our war finance.

The war and the sale of Government bonds have necessarily disarranged and will continue to disarrange financial conditions. This corporation will be a national agency which to a great extent may overcome much of the disorganized conditions produced by the war and by the sale of Government bonds.

It is proposed through this corporation to aid banks that are extending credits to corporations and firms that are necessary and contributory to the prosecution of the war, evidenced by the notes of such corporations and firms. It is also proposed to aid these banks by discounting paper secured by the obligations of the corporations and firms necessary and contributory to the prosecution of the war. Thus, Mr. President, we strengthen the banks that help the industries engaged in doing the work essential to the conduct of the war. The bank which helps financially such an industry understands that this corporation we are now creating will be in a position to discount its paper taken from these war industries and discount its paper secured by the obligations of these war industries. Safeguards are thrown around the loans. They are put in a shape to make them secure, but it helps the banks of the country to feel more secure when they are helping to fight the war by advances to war industries.

Next, as to savings banks, we understand fully that depositors in savings banks are likely from time to time to withdraw their money to buy Government bonds. Of course we are gratified to have them do so. The savings banks usually invest the money received from their depositors in long-time nonliquid securities. To make the savings banks stronger, this corporation can loan directly to them where it becomes necessary. Thus these institutions so essential to our national prosperity will be placed in position to meet unusual withdrawals.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. PAGE. Is the Senator prepared to express an opinion at this time as to whether the issuance of 4½ per cent bonds would prompt a large withdrawal from the savings banks?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not. I hope we shall not be compelled to issue 4½ per cent bonds.

Mr. PAGE. I put a hypothetical question. If we should do so, what is the Senator's opinion?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I doubt whether it would cause as large withdrawals of savings bank deposits as might seem probable. Next year the depositors may need their money, six months from now they may expect to use their money, and there are a great many reasons why the savings bank certificate is more desirable for savings bank depositors than long-time securities.

Mr. PAGE. I agree with the Senator fully in regard to the smaller depositors in savings banks, but we have a few depositors who deposit quite large sums and it becomes, of course, with them a pure, cold matter of profit and loss. I wondered if the issue of 4½ per cent bonds might not in a small measure at least embarrass the banks unless we have some provision to safeguard it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This legislation is a safeguard against that embarrassment. It is intended to give this corporation with large resources an opportunity to help steady any abnormal conditions that may develop financially as the war goes on and as bond issues are made.

The third class, as I shall handle it, of loans to be made by this corporation are directly to the public utility companies, and the corporations conducting an established and going business, whose operations are necessary and contributory to the prosecution of the war, and which the board finds of exceptional importance in the public interest. That is quite a wide discretion. I favor accepting the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and adding, on page 10, before the word "security," in line 3, the word "adequate." I would do this lest the language on the prior page might indicate a different purpose, lest the language on the prior page, which deals with the public interest, might cause the board of directors to feel that they were expected to regard what they deemed the public interest too largely and the value of the securities too lightly. I do not think they would do so, but I believe the word "adequate" should be placed before the word "security," on the third line of page 10.

Thus briefly, Mr. President, I have called attention to the way in which this corporation is expected to help carry the general responsibility that falls upon the Nation financially. It has a further authority to buy Government bonds. Of course, this is not meant as a "pegging" proposition. It is not meant

that this corporation will undertake to purchase all Government bonds that fall below par, but I desire to mention in this connection that few Government bonds, our last liberty bonds, have sold below par. The evidence before the Finance Committee disclosed the fact that \$50,000,000 of these bonds are about all that have changed hands out of the great volume sold by the Government. Purchasers had supplied themselves in part from patriotic reasons and in part as a permanent investment under the original sale. An active purchaser in the market with \$50,000,000 would have put the bonds practically up to par, for only about \$50,000,000 of bonds came into the market. I think it is valuable for us to remember this fact, because it shows that there is really no weakness but strength in the Government bonds.

Now, Mr. President, this corporation is to be given a capital of \$500,000,000 out of the Treasury as it is called for by the board of directors, and then it has the privilege of issuing from time to time \$4,000,000,000 of bonds. These bonds are required to be of not less than one year's time and not over five years.

It has been asked by the Senator from New Hampshire why should this corporation issue bonds, why not simply issue bonds by the Government and increase its capital out of the National Treasury? There are a number of reasons why it is believed that the bond issue by this corporation to increase its available capital is more desirable than for it to draw upon the Treasury.

These bonds will meet a demand that the Government bonds do not meet. They are shorter-time bonds. They may run for only one year. They can not run over five years. Their time of payment is intended to take them out of the field of the bonds sold by the Government and to fit them into a place where capital will be seeking an investment to which the Government issues do not apply.

If it were suggested that we might have the short-time Government bonds just as well, the reply is that if we made the Government bonds so short we would have to sell again bonds to meet them on maturity, while this corporation issuing its bonds invests the money in assets which it will turn into cash to meet its bonds. Each time it issues a bond and loans money it takes a security maturing before the bond matures, and its maturing securities all the time are expected to enable it to meet its bond issues.

It occupies in that respect a position entirely different from the Treasury. When the National Government meets its bonds it must either have money from taxation or money from other bond sales with which to meet them. In present conditions for the Government to sell a short-time bond would simply be a short-time bond to be met by the sale of another short-time bond. So it is believed that this corporation, with bonds as sound as Government bonds, will, through the short-time bonds, be able to meet a demand that the Government bond would not meet.

Criticism has been made upon these bonds because they have a certain status at the Federal reserve bank.

The suggestion has been made that this bond issue would tend toward an undue expansion of the currency. Mr. President, this bill does not change a single restriction that is placed around the Federal reserve banks in the issue of Federal reserve notes. It only provides that the bonds of this corporation may be used at the Federal reserve banks just as Government bonds are used; it stops there. If a loan is to be obtained at a Federal reserve bank, it still can only be obtained by one of the member banks upon the paper of that member bank, and that paper must mature in not less than 90 days.

The bonds of this corporation can not be used at the Federal reserve banks to change that limitation upon the character of paper that alone must at a Federal reserve bank be made the basis of the issue of Federal reserve notes; these bonds may be given by the member bank as security for its 90-day paper—that is all. It can now give any Government bond as security. The member bank alone can borrow from the Federal reserve banks. The member bank can give one of these bonds as security for its 90-day paper instead of giving a Government bond—that is all—but it must be the paper of a member bank, and that paper must be due in 90 days, upon which a loan is made or Federal reserve notes issued.

Going one step further, the privilege of using these bonds on the part of member banks as security for their notes does not in any way change the provision in the Federal reserve act that requires a Federal reserve bank to maintain 40 per cent of gold against all the Federal reserve notes issued from it. The Federal reserve bank is also required to maintain 35 per cent of gold or of lawful money against its deposits. This bill does not change any of those requirements.

Now, let us see what is the present status of the Federal reserve banks. On February 21 they had available of gold

\$1,772,000,000; they had legal-tender notes, silver, and so forth, to the amount of \$60,000,000; making a total of \$1,832,000,000. Of that, \$1,773,000,000 were deposits. Against their deposits they must permanently maintain, out of this \$1,832,000,000, 35 per cent. This amounts to six hundred and twenty million seven hundred and odd-thousand dollars. They have already issued Federal reserve notes to the amount of \$1,314,000,000. Against that issue they must maintain a 40 per cent reserve. When we deduct from their present gold and legal-tender notes and silver the reserve they must maintain against their deposits and against their Federal reserve notes, they have a balance of \$682,000,000 against which they can issue Federal reserve notes. Instead of their being authorized, as a result of the passage of this bill, to increase the Federal reserve notes to any great extent, to-day on all classes of securities, on the notes of the Federal reserve banks, on Government bonds, and on these bonds, they could not issue, if they maintained their present deposits, over \$1,700,000,000. So I think we need have no disturbance of mind about these bonds affecting in any way our Federal reserve banks.

These are short-time bonds. The large quantity of Government bonds have not gone to any considerable amount into the Federal reserve banks. The Federal Reserve Board is authorized to control the issue of Federal reserve notes, and it is authorized to fix a discriminatory interest rate, applicable to Federal reserve notes issued and secured by these bonds in excess of the amount that it fixes on other transactions in the Federal reserve banks.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLIS. Unless these bonds are used as the basis for the issue of Federal reserve currency, how will they help to get additional funds for quick asset purposes?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not exactly understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator from Georgia says that these bonds will not do any harm, because they will not be used; he argued that because the liberty bonds have not been used to any great extent for the purpose of getting additional currency these bonds will not be so used. Unless these bonds are used for that purpose, what good are they going to do for the purpose of getting quick cash capital?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Well, I do not understand exactly what the Senator means by "quick cash capital." These bonds can be sold to individuals just as liberty bonds were sold or can be sold to banks and to investors generally. They can procure "quick cash capital" for this corporation without going to the Federal reserve banks at all.

What I was undertaking to show was that there was no cause for alarm upon the theory that these bonds would be rushed into the Federal reserve banks. There is no rush upon the Federal reserve banks for the issue of Federal reserve notes. These short-time bonds are expected to meet a demand for investment entirely different from the Government bonds. They are made for a length of time shorter than are the Government bonds. They can run for from one to five years; they may be only one year in duration. It is therefore believed that they can and will be used for investment purposes by private citizens as well as by corporations and by estates, where the desire is not to make a long-time investment, and that they will fill a demand in such cases for investment which the Government bond does not meet. These bonds are given this privilege with reference to the Federal reserve banks just as Government bonds are in order that there might be full confidence in their stability, their value as an investment be appreciated by the public, and that banks can use them with the Federal reserve banks as security for their 90-day loans.

The other important provision in the bill is the creation of a board to supervise bond issues. There is already a committee doing that work, and so far there has been nothing but support given by the public to its work. I believe it consists of two members of the Federal Reserve Board and three outsiders, who hold no office, but who cooperate with the other members. I am not familiar with the business of the three outsiders, but I recall that when their names were mentioned before the Finance Committee those who knew them all seemed to think their selection was ideal.

The new plan of organization is to put this responsibility on the Federal Reserve Board. When it was suggested to the Secretary of the Treasury that the Federal Reserve Board should act, he promptly agreed that it was entirely satisfactory to him. The public knows the Federal Reserve Board. That is certainly one organization that has won universal confidence;

and it was believed that those who might have bonds to dispose of, already knowing the work of the Federal Reserve Board, would feel greater confidence if the responsibility was practically put in their hands, and the Secretary of the Treasury, when it was suggested, said it certainly was perfectly agreeable to him. The three members of the Federal Reserve Board and two outsiders, selected, I believe, by the Federal Reserve Board, are to constitute that committee.

Of course, it is the exercise of a very great responsibility, but we all realize that it is essential. I believe there was no dissent in the Finance Committee of the Senate from the view that such action was essential. The question was, How could we perfect an organization that would inspire universal confidence, and that we could lean upon with the assurance that the work of the organization charged with this duty would be acceptable? And the solution proposed was unanimously reached.

This bill, I trust, will substantially help to steady the finances of the country during the war; but our people should finance the war by the economies they practice. It is the patriotic duty of each individual to reduce his expenses to the extreme limit. It requires no high degree of intelligence to see that we are fighting for something nearer to us than world-wide democracy or European boundaries. The Balkan States are in the hands of Germany, and the Prussian war lords are extending their domination over Russia toward the Pacific Ocean. The German people have been taught to hope, to struggle, and to fight for world-wide conquest. They must be stopped or the barbarous treatment accorded to the Belgians may be repeated on our own soil, among our own people, upon our own wives and children. If Germany should win the war, the least that would be exacted of the United States would be a huge war indemnity. We should prefer death to submission. We lacked vision in 1914, or we then would have made preparation for war. Let us not longer be blind; let us at once prepare with every resource for this war; let every man understand that the sacrifices made of comforts, of property, and of life are made because they are necessary to save his own country and his own family.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, in September last I introduced a bill to amend the Federal reserve act, which authorized the Federal Reserve Board to accept such bonds or notes of any railroad, industrial, public-utility corporation, or municipality that the Federal Reserve Board might approve as security for temporary loans on the same basis as commercial paper is taken to-day.

At that time I felt that it would not be long before the country would be face to face with a situation which would warrant some such legislation. The Federal Reserve Board and the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, to which my bill was referred, were of the opinion that the enactment of that bill would bring about an inflation in our financial system which might prove disastrous.

I did not agree with their conclusion, and so, when the measure now under consideration was introduced, with the backing of the Federal Reserve Board and of the Secretary of the Treasury, it seemed to me that, to some degree, it was an indorsement of my attitude of last summer.

This measure is a very radical departure from our financial system and one that all of us must approach with the feeling that, except for the extraordinary conditions facing the Nation, no such measure should be considered.

During the last session of Congress upward of \$18,000,000,000 were appropriated for the conduct of the war, and a revenue bill was enacted which, it is hoped, will bring to the Treasury for this fiscal year upward of \$3,000,000,000. Liberty bonds have been sold aggregating \$6,297,000,000.

Treasury notes and other means have been resorted to to secure the necessary money to conduct the Government's business and to finance the war. All of these bond issues and tax levies, as well as other activities of the Government, have so completely changed our normal financial arrangements that some such measure as the one now under consideration becomes absolutely necessary.

It is needless to say that I have conferred with the leading financiers of the city of New York, who have been as much concerned as anyone in America to see that the Nation's finances are kept in such condition as to avoid disaster.

This legislation deals with the very fundamentals of business. It is a proposition which warrants the most careful consideration of the Congress, Mr. President. It has caused wide discussion among those interested in our financial institutions. There is a great divergence of opinion among men of affairs in this country as to whether this bill meets all the requirements and whether there is any possible danger of undue inflation. We must all appreciate the fact that inflation, to some extent, is unavoidable.

I shall not discuss the general terms of this measure, Mr. President. They have already been completely covered by others. I wish to say, however, that the bill, in the main, meets with my approval.

Permit me to call the Senate's attention to certain amendments that I have given notice of my intention to propose.

These amendments secure to the savings banks, building and loan associations, and insurance companies of the country the opportunity to protect their immense interests in case necessity arises. Certainly there are no concerns in this country whose interests should be more carefully safeguarded than these very institutions.

Section 6, paragraph C, provides for advances to savings banks and should include life insurance companies. Calls for money are not so readily made in life insurance companies as in savings banks, but who may tell what may happen if the war continues for any length of time? All modern life insurance policies give the policyholder the right to borrow nearly the whole amount held by the company for his policy, and the loans made by life insurance companies in New York State alone amounted to \$693,000,000 in 1916. With a prolonged war these loans might assume dimensions dangerous to the interests of these institutions, which had assets on December 31, 1916, to the total of \$5,144,000,000, one-half of which was invested in stocks and bonds and one-third in bonds and mortgages on real estate.

Besides, there is no provision in life insurance policies which enables the companies to require previous notice of desire to borrow.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that life insurance companies should be in one class with savings banks, so far as assistance by the Government is concerned.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. CALDER. I do.

Mr. KELLOGG. Do I understand the Senator from New York to say that life insurance companies and fire insurance companies should be taken care of in this bill?

Mr. CALDER. I may say to the Senator that I propose introducing amendments which will permit companies organized under the insurance laws of the respective States to come to this corporation for relief. I am convinced that the very inclusion of a provision of that kind will do much to protect the insurance companies; and if it does not, if they need to come, I believe they should have the right.

Mr. KELLOGG. But insurance companies do not receive deposits. They are loaners of money rather than institutions receiving deposits.

Mr. CALDER. That is true.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator think that all the business in the United States should be done by the Federal Government?

Mr. CALDER. I will say to the Senator that in these unusual days, when the laws that have been enacted and the operation of the war have so completely disturbed every sort of business, the time may come when insurance companies will need relief, and this bill should be so fixed as to afford them relief.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. May I ask the Senator to point out the necessity for such an amendment? Does he know at the present time of any insurance companies, either life or fire, that need relief of this character or that in any way can contribute, by reason of the fact that they are supported by the Government, to any war emergency?

Mr. CALDER. I can readily understand how a condition of affairs might arise that would warrant a life insurance company in appealing to this corporation for relief. I have indicated in my remarks that on the 1st of January, 1917, the life insurance companies in the State of New York had loaned to their policyholders, under the privileges accorded policyholders by their policies, a sum equal to nearly \$700,000,000. Suppose the necessities of the war require that policyholders should borrow large sums of money upon their policies. I should like to have this law in such shape that the directors of this corporation could loan to life insurance companies on their securities sufficient money to take care of their immediate needs. The fact that a provision of this character is incorporated in the bill would in itself probably prevent calling upon the corporation for relief.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. CALDER. Now, if the Senator wishes me to answer regarding fire insurance companies, I will say this:

A few years ago we had an unusual conflagration in Baltimore, and after that another at San Francisco. As a result

many of the fire insurance companies of this country were very near bankruptcy because of the immense drain upon their resources. My amendment, while not specifically including any particular sort of insurance companies, would permit their coming to the corporation for relief if they were in dire need. I simply afford by these amendments the opportunity to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Has the Senator noticed that under section 6, paragraph (d), if a fire insurance company or a life insurance company should be in dire need it could apply directly to the board under that paragraph? I call attention to the paragraph, and then will ask the Senator if that would not be satisfactory. I read paragraph (d):

To make advances directly (1) to any corporation owning or controlling (directly or through stock ownership) any railroad or other public utility—

Now—

and (2) to any firm, corporation, or association conducting an established and going business whose operations are necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war.

If a life insurance company or a fire insurance company is considered as a corporation whose operations are necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, under that provision it could make a direct appeal to the corporation for assistance, and no doubt if it were in peril it would receive the needed relief. Has the Senator thought of that part of this paragraph in connection with the insurance companies, both fire and life?

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I have examined the provision referred to by the Senator from Utah, and it is possible that the language might be construed as covering the very thought that I have in mind. I was constrained to offer these amendments at the request of many gentlemen interested in these great insurance corporations, who feel that it is possible that they may be forced to apply for help, and are anxious that this law should be so fixed that they might be afforded the opportunity if necessary.

Mr. SMOOT. I think if the Senator will give that provision of the bill careful consideration he will find that it is so broad in its scope that it can take in almost any kind of corporation or association that is now doing business, and that if they are in dire trouble they can be taken care of by this corporation, and that they will not be forced even to go to the bank and allow the bank to do it for them. In other words, they would be in a privileged class and not forced to put up the security that the banks would have to put up, or even the savings banks, if they went to the corporation for assistance.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator is correct, and it may be that the language in the provision he has just quoted covers the ground. I was prompted to introduce these amendments because I was anxious that our building and loan companies, which have in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000,000 loaned on bonded mortgages throughout the country, that our insurance companies, that our mortgage insurance companies, which alone in New York City have upward of \$700,000,000 worth of guaranteed mortgages, might be afforded protection in these days when their money market is drained.

I would also call attention to the fact that the market for property and real property securities has been affected by war conditions, and the Government activities have practically drained this market of all money and left it entirely without resources for payment or the refunding of its obligations, and it is not able to bear its part in assisting the Government to finance the war.

Previous to the entrance of the United States into the war it was not only possible but a matter of routine to pay or refund maturing obligations of this nature. Do you know that the large volume of money hitherto available for these transactions has been diverted entirely and completely to other channels, chiefly to investments in liberty bonds? This to the almost complete paralysis of this great market.

Estimates of the volume of existing mortgages upon real property in the city of New York alone vary between four and five billion dollars. Of this amount, approximately 25 per cent mature and become due and payable every year. Hitherto this has been taken care of and has been performed with little friction, for the exchange currents have always been provided with sufficient current funds.

The war conditions, however, have completely changed the situation. A large number of investors in loans upon real property securities are demanding payment of maturing obligations. This is a peculiarly menacing feature of present condi-

tions in its bearing upon holders of mortgaged property for there is open to them no way of relief from foreclosure and the possible loss of their equities.

There is a peril for the savings banks of the country, also, in the prospect of the offering of a large Government loan issue at a rate of interest higher than 4 per cent. Few savings banks can pay or are paying over 4 per cent interest now. It is feared that their depositors might find in the 4½ per cent liberty bond attractions superior to that offered by the savings banks. If there should be any general demand for the withdrawal of deposits from the savings banks they would under present conditions be unable to pay.

It is interesting to note, Mr. President, that the assets of the savings banks of New York State are to-day approximately \$2,300,000,000. At least one-half of this sum is invested in bonds and mortgages on real estate and 75 per cent of the remaining half is invested in stocks and bonds.

It is also well to take into consideration the calamity that might befall our fire insurance companies if we should have a repetition of the conflagration of several years ago in Baltimore, unless the fire insurance companies were also included within the operations of the corporation authorized by this act.

So, Mr. President, I have offered these several amendments to permit relief to be obtained by corporations organized under banking or insurance laws of any State.

For the successful prosecution of the war it will be absolutely necessary to put at ease the working people, who are the mainstay of the Nation, as well as the savings banks and life insurance companies. If they know that they can get their savings from these institutions any time they need them this assurance would encourage them to deposit their earnings in the savings banks and to carry insurance on their lives. The savings banks and the life insurance companies would in turn invest these savings in securities to provide the Government with funds for the prosecution of the war.

I trust, Mr. President, that the Senators will examine these amendments and that when the vote is taken they will give them their support.

I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, a statement of the assets of the life insurance companies and savings banks doing business in the State of New York as of December 31, 1916.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the printing is authorized.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Assets of life insurance companies and savings banks doing business in the State of New York, 1916.*

	Life insurance companies.	Savings banks.
Real estate.....	\$142,784,475	\$32,054,263
Stocks and bonds.....	2,377,987,417	837,919,017
Bonds and mortgages.....	1,651,017,014	1,091,543,465
Collateral loans.....	9,798,507	1,730,763
Loans to policyholders.....	603,054,073	
Premium notes, etc.....	29,336,855	
Cash in banks, etc.....	54,867,799	151,256,190
Deferred and uncollected premiums.....	69,325,492	
Collectible interest.....		24,441,716
All other assets.....	79,568,381	347,623
Total.....	5,144,624,477	2,139,299,037

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, if I understand the purport of this bill, its object is to guarantee at this time the credits of the railroads who are in dire need of funds to enlarge their equipment and to carry on their business. I understand there is nearly a billion dollars of maturities this year that will be required to finance the railroads. I feel that the support of the Government should end there. I do not agree with that portion of the bill which guarantees to individual corporations or individuals these credits.

If we are going as a Government to guarantee and indorse the credit of private business, there will be no end to it. The laws of the various States regulate the life insurance companies incorporated in them, as well as the fire insurance companies. They provide certain reserves for contingencies such as conflagrations and such as depreciation in securities. If the capital of a fire insurance company becomes too greatly impaired, it is insolvent, and it must wind up and reinsure its risks; and I do not believe it is necessary at this time for the Federal Government to guarantee the credit of fire insurance companies. I think if the securities which they hold in the railroad corporations of this country are guaranteed by the Government, that is all that is necessary. I think the fire insurance companies can take care of themselves without this assistance.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I should like very much to bring myself into a frame of mind where I could vote for this bill in its entirety. I can not do so, much as I should like to see some of the purposes of the bill carried out.

The bill, as it is now, is a bill to extend relief to indigent millionaires, more or less worthy or unworthy. I do not see any relief here for the average man who is transacting business. He could not get within a thousand miles of help or the Treasury Department.

There are a great many investments of savings banks, fire insurance companies, life insurance companies, and trust companies that handle a variety of trust funds for estates, for guardianships, many of them running for a term of years by the provisions of the testamentary trust. The older a country is the more that class of investment appears. Many of those have their funds invested in municipal bond and in drainage bonds. When I use the term "municipal bonds" I mean it in the general sense that any branch or subdivision of a State government created under any of the laws of a State are comprised in that term. These bonds, especially the serial issues, fall due from time to time. They are drawn by lot or fall due in serial numbers. They are paid off out of the proceeds, sometimes of sinking funds, sometimes from a special tax levied under the provisions of the State constitution requiring a direct annual tax to be levied during the lifetime of the issue, which in some States is for a limited term of years—10 years, 20 years, 30 years. This direct annual levy is for the purpose of creating a sinking fund to discharge the entire indebtedness upon its maturity or for the discharge of a given number of bonds at fixed intervals during the period preceding the maturity of the last or all of them. Not only these sinking funds are invested, but in the instances where the principal is paid off it is necessary, in all the cases I have alluded to of the trust funds waiting investment, to reinvestment those same funds in some adequate security.

Municipal bonds running into very large sums in this country have been an appropriate method of investment. State statutes have been framed authorizing such investment. Many orders have been entered by various courts of the country having a general chancery or equity jurisdiction authorizing investment in certain classes of bonds as securities, very largely of the municipal securities. This measure prohibits in its necessary terms the issue of municipal securities. There is no escape from the conclusion. It is true a municipality may not be expressly hampered by an act of Congress in the issue of its securities; but whenever the securities are issued, whether an original or a refunding issue, it is indispensable for the municipality to find a market. It can not find a market ordinarily by itself peddling the bonds out, as the phrase goes, among the permanent investors. It goes to a bond house or a trust company, some place where the persons are skilled in finding a market for that form of security. Necessarily, then, under the provisions of this bill, a bond house is subject to a penalty the instant it takes a municipal security and attempts to sell it on the market, unless licensed. The municipality can sell to the agent, to the bond house, or to the trust company or to a national bank, but if the bond house undertakes to sell to a third person it is subject to penalties under this bill. Therefore it in effect prohibits the issuing and marketing of municipal securities.

Then comes the utilities, the gas, the electric light, the street car, the interurban, the several forms of activity in which considerable sums are invested. That property has two sources of value. The one is the tangible or physical property and the other is the franchise or permit under which it operates. Both of them are a property value. That is taken into account upon the issuing of bonds and in marketing them to prospective investors. Of these not one issue of any kind can be marketed without a license. First, there is a capital issues committee, under whose permit only are these issues made. If they deny it, the issue must stop. Therefore it stops at the source of issue of all these securities as well as later on stopping the marketing of municipal securities. The power to license implies the power to refuse.

I believe that the powers concentrated in this bill are of that character that never ought to be put in the hands of any living person. There is no one man who lives, or series of men by which he can surround himself, who possesses that universal omniscience that will make him wiser than all the persons interested in the municipal utility securities or municipal bonds of the country where those are sold. There is no man who can be created, no single person, who is wiser than everybody. Heretofore all these securities have been marketed upon the general demand for them when offered to those who are seeking

investment. It seems to me that it is a very dangerous thing to interfere with this vital process of our investment affairs.

The Secretary of the Treasury in the hearings before the committee admits and attempts to justify the fact that no municipal security of any kind can be issued without his consent. Practically they can issue them, but they can not get beyond into the general market, because no one can handle them unless the municipality sells direct and undertakes the almost impossible task of finding a general market. The bond house or the trust company acts as the distributor. It finds the small investor, it takes the bonds in an entirety, pays for them, holds them, and finds the public, so that when these securities are digested it is through these agencies that are now prohibited by penalty from selling any of the bonds.

Another thing I think it well enough to keep in mind: I do not know whether we are keeping track of the pace we are driving in the delegation of power or not. I doubt very much whether the general public has kept that in mind. The Secretary of the Treasury has large powers. To begin with, he controls through his influence all the national banks of the country. He necessarily has great influence with the Comptroller of the Currency. In addition to that he has a controlling voice on the Federal Reserve Board. It is by recent legislation put in his power to control two hundred and fifty-odd thousand miles of steam railways in the country, together with all of their securities both past, present, and prospective, some \$18,000,000,000 worth of securities. In addition to that he proposes by this bill to put his hand upon the pulse beat of every municipality in the country, so that not one dollar in effect can be issued or marketed without his consent. In addition to that, he has all of the vast powers that go with and through the Federal Reserve Board, the contraction and expansion of the currency.

There is now in this country \$3,000,000,000 worth of free gold. That is our gold supply, in round figures, all the net result of our trade balance of some years past of a favorable character, settled by gold shipments to this country. By looking at the daily United States Treasury report of February 25, 1918, I find assets that would be a part of the money in circulation, gold coin a given sum, gold bullion a given sum, both of which added make \$2,400,000,000, in round figures, of gold assets. Against that are liabilities of outstanding gold certificates of \$1,255,000,000, a gold settlement fund under the Federal Reserve Board of \$914,000,000, and the \$152,000,000 and over of gold reserve that has been held to preserve the value of the \$346,000,000 of greenbacks that are outstanding, together with available gold in the general fund of \$78,000,000 and over, making the total liability to balance the total gold assets.

Under this bill there is a \$500,000,000 capital stock that is to be subscribed by the United States. So the Government is the only shareholder in the war finance corporation. The only way to pay for these shares is to draw cash from the Treasury. It requires, then, a half billion dollars to begin with to finance this concern and make it a going enterprise.

These resources are to be loaned for the purpose of promoting various distressed millionaires in the country. I do not know of a single utility in all the United States that finally, when you track it down to earth, is not owned by one or two or five men. I do not care what may be the size of the city. After all, these gentlemen ordinarily take care of themselves. None of them is likely to land in a bankruptcy court.

This bill, in the first instance, will extend relief to this needy portion of the American people. I am not particularly interested in relieving the clamorous poor of that kind in my part of the country. All of them can obtain relief on the market. They have been able to do so in the past, and I decline to lend myself to extracting \$500,000,000 out of the taxpayers to relieve these gentlemen.

I can call the list of public utilities in one, the third largest State in the Union, from the city of Chicago clear down to East St. Louis. When I call the list of those public utilities, I call the list of enterprises owned by men who do not need relief under this bill. They will survive any and all operations if the Government itself survives. It will be necessary to wreck everything in the way of public or private business before these enterprises will go to the wall.

After this part has been attended to there can be eight times the capital stock of the company with the war finance corporation issued in bonds. Eight times the capital stock makes \$4,000,000,000 of bonds to be put upon the market in various ways. I presume along comes one of these distressed utilities. It may have half a million dollars of bonds maturing. If they were to go out on the market, ordinarily, a large part of their bonds paying 5 per cent now, they would pay the same rate when renewed or refunded. The gas company in Chicago, the

People's Gas Light & Coke Co., the electric light, the power, all of those enterprises ordinarily are now paying 5 per cent on their securities. The Government I do not anticipate would loan them at 5 per cent. It probably would loan at some more favorable figure.

After this is done these securities, if the new issue is required or an old issue is to be refunded, are to be called in, taken by the War Finance Corporation, and in lieu of them to the former holders of these securities there is to be issued these bonds of the War Finance Corporation, which, in effect, as I understand, are to be Government bonds. It imposes a liability upon the Government. Reading the hearings on this bill I come to the conclusion, guided largely by the opinion of the Secretary of the Treasury, that they become in effect obligations of the Government. So in substance the Government takes the utility bond issues, or whatever the security is, of whatever enterprise we are considering needful for relief, puts them in the hands of the War Finance Corporation as collateral security, and issues in lieu of what in effect I will denominate "Government bonds." It may do so in all to the extent of \$4,000,000,000.

These bonds when issued are available in the hands of the former owners of the security for borrowing purposes. They may go to a member bank of any Federal reserve district, put up those bonds as collateral, give their notes, and the member bank may then carry those notes to the Federal reserve bank and rediscount them. A provision of the bill provides that these notes then become eligible as a basis for the issue of Federal reserve notes. In other words, they thereby broaden the base for the issue of Federal reserve notes.

I have no objection to taking care in a legitimate way of all maturing credits, but in effect it goes further. It furnishes a basis of \$4,000,000,000 of expansion of the money in circulation.

It is said there must be a 40 per cent gold reserve. That is true. All of the gold certificates are now being called in. I challenge any Member of the Senate to go down and cash a check in Washington any place or with the financial clerk of the Senate and get a gold certificate. You may travel up and down the Atlantic coast on a several days' journey and it will be an accident if you find a gold certificate at any time or place in your travels. The gold certificates, in fact, are being impounded by the Federal reserve banks of the country. They are calling them in, and wherever they get one in a Federal reserve bank there it stays.

With \$3,000,000,000 of free gold in the United States and with \$2,400,000,000 reported on February 25, 1918, in the Treasury statement, we have on a 40 per cent basis in the Treasury statement a means of figuring what the possible expansion of Federal reserve notes may be. With a 40 per cent basis on every \$1,000,000,000 worth of Federal reserve notes you have got to have \$400,000,000 of gold or gold certificates. That is the reserve. On the entire amount that is in the Treasury statement, taking it in round figures, there could be an expansion of over \$5,000,000,000 of Federal reserve notes with the 40 per cent gold reserve back of it. If by any possibility the Government called in or acquired more of the free gold of the United States up to the \$3,000,000,000, we could issue more than the figure named out of the \$3,000,000,000 of free gold, and the Government, if it were possible to get it all, could issue \$7,500,000 of additional Federal reserve notes.

Examine your pocketbooks, all of you, the change you carry and your bills, and you will find that now you have nothing but Federal reserve notes to transact business on around Washington and up and down the coast. I think the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] gave the figures this morning. We already have—I quote from memory—about one billion seven hundred and some million dollars of Federal reserve notes. If we add to that a potential \$5,000,000,000 additional of Federal reserve notes, or going to the full limit of \$7,500,000,000, we have reached over \$9,000,000,000 of Federal reserve notes alone, and still it is said that we are not traveling on a gallop along on the road to inflation. We are not merely traveling there, we have reached the neighborhood now.

When the amount of securities is increased still farther, when more bond issues come along and there are more liberty loans, credit will be still further expanded. To keep pace with the expansion of credit there must be an expansion of the money in circulation. I have some of the figures as to circulation that are given here by the Treasury reports. In 1914 there was per head in the United States \$34.35 of money in circulation; there was in January, 1916, two years later, \$38.48; in 1917, there was \$43 per head in circulation; and on the 1st of January, 1918, there was \$48.76 per head in circulation; in other words, we are traveling very rapidly in increasing the money in circulation in this country. That increase in circulation is one of the reasons for the prices that are disturbing a great many gentlemen at this time.

I am not willing to put into the hands of one person these powers. In all candor, without being desirous of starting a political discussion in this Chamber, with these vast powers concentrated in the hands of one official, I should like to inquire what gentleman would feel safe if William J. Bryan were now the Secretary of the Treasury with the powers already vested together with those contemplated in this bill? It is not so much a question of whether Mr. McAdoo may wisely exercise these powers; it is what somebody else with all the financial idiosyncracies of Mr. Bryan might do if afterwards called upon to fill that office. The danger or the wisdom of extending these powers is to be measured by the possible abuse of the powers some time in the future by some one who will not be guided by the wise limitations of the present incumbent of that office. I can not, therefore, Mr. President, bring myself to support this bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KING. I hold no brief for Mr. Bryan, but if the Senator will remember, Mr. Bryan was never an advocate of fiat money, he never was an advocate of greenbackism. He merely accepted the view that was crystallized into law on the foundation of this Republic that there should be gold and silver as the money of ultimate redemption. The Senator will remember that the first financial bill that was proposed by Hamilton was a recognition of gold and silver as the money of ultimate redemption upon a parity. That was well established and was recognized in all the world. Mr. Bryan, possessing, as the Senator says, idiosyncracies, did not have the idiosyncrasy of advocating greenbackism or fiat money, but merely insisted that there should be a free coinage of silver upon a certain established basis, and he proposed that the financial policy of the founders of the Republic should be adopted as the policy of the Republic.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I will accept part of the Senator's statement. At the time to which he refers in our earlier history, when gold and silver were both money of ultimate redemption, the ratio was 15½ to 1. Mr. Bryan went one-half better, and made it 16 to 1, which became at once the consecrated, God-ordained ratio between the two metals. At the time when the ratio was 15½ to 1 silver in reality was worth more than gold. Silver had not been mined extensively; it was not available in the world's supply at that time so as to make that ratio desirable, and, as a matter of fact, silver went out of circulation during the time when the ratio was unfavorable to silver; it became merchandise rather than money. Just as soon, however, as the ratio was disturbed by its large production and silver became the cheaper money on the market, this idiosyncrasy to which I referred began to manifest itself in a very active way.

I am not particularly wedded to gold, but gold is the most stable of the metals. We are on a gold standard basis to-day. Gold is not only stable, but its price is world-wide; it is not subject to fluctuation in the ordinary market at any place in civilized countries. So when it is said that the distinguished commoner was not in favor of fiat money it is true, but I judge of a man's ultimate destination by his symptoms, and by the direction in which his toes are pointed rather than the length of the step he is taking.

At the time, Mr. President, that the distinguished Commoner from Nebraska was cleaving the air all over this country with his peculiar doctrine on monetary reform, with the ratio of the metals separated, I could go down to El Paso, Tex., and buy for 49 cents a silver peso with more grains of pure silver in it than a silver dollar in this country. I carried a bag full of it around until I nearly wore it out. There was free coinage of silver across the Rio Grande River, and there had been for years. Mexico had a dollar which was worth more than ours in point of mere bullion quantity if it had been worth par, but you could pound up the bullion in a Mexican silver dollar and sell it on the market for only 49 cents. Therein was the peculiar attractiveness of that kind of a dollar to Mr. Bryan.

It was the degree of the disease at that particular time that was attractive, and it is the kind of disease that I make the subject of criticism, because ultimately it leads a man to the fiat money destination. With that kind of a man at the head of the Treasury I submit that this kind of a bill if enacted into law would be a public menace. It would put in his hands the instrumentalities to wreck the credit of this country and to bring us to some unheard-of and unthinkable standard of monetary reform.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes.

Mr. KING. I do not want to break into the very interesting and very instructive speech of the Senator from Illinois; and, if he will permit me to say so, his speeches are always interesting and always instructive; but I want to differ from him in one statement which he has just made. Probably I am wrong and the superior knowledge of the Senator will justify the statement which he made, namely, that gold is more stable in value than silver has been or than is any other article or any other commodity. I do not know that I quote the Senator accurately, but the idea that the Senator ought to convey was that gold ought to be the measure or standard of value, because it is more fixed in its price or value when measured by other commodities. I think the Senator is in error in that respect.

So long as silver was a money among the people and had not been demonetized by Governments, I think the record and evidence relative to money, especially if you will read Mr. Jacob and other great writers upon the subject, will tend to show that silver has been more stable in value, measured by a given number of commodities, than has gold.

Gold has fluctuated greatly in value. The discovery of gold in California, the discovery of gold in the Rand Region, in South Africa, the discovery of gold in Australia and in the Klondike, when the golden stream was poured out into the arteries of trade, necessarily caused a tremendous fluctuation in values. Gold then, measured by a given number of articles, did not have the same fixed price as silver would have had under similar circumstances if it had been a money of ultimate redemption the same as gold.

The point I am trying to make is that gold, I think, in the history of the world has shown more violent fluctuations in value, measured by given standards, by the value of a given number of commodities, than has silver when silver has not been demonetized. Silver in this country did not show the disparity in value to which the Senator from Illinois referred until we demonetized it in 1871 and 1873. I think that if we had not demonetized silver there would not have been that disparity between the price of gold and the price of silver.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thank the Senator for his complimentary reference, which I certainly value. I can return the compliment many times over, for I always listen to the Senator from Utah with pleasure. I shall not be drawn aside, however, by the very great respect I have for him and his associates on the majority side of the Chamber from the historic fact that this agitation never begins until the appearance of some cheaper metal that can be used as a legal tender. Then immediately arises the difficulty, and the consequent clamor for a change. It is one of the historic truths that when there is discovered some cheaper form of metal that may be made legal tender advocates of the kind to which I inadvertently referred a while ago are always active in the zeal with which they carry their views forward. The conclusion to which I inevitably arrive is that all of the distinguished advocates of such movements are searching for some easier way to pay debts. Of course, legal-tender decisions in this country have made it possible to make almost anything legal tender that carries a Government promise on its face, and such forms of legal tender will discharge the obligation of a debt. Having paid the debt, no Government can fix its purchasing power.

The Treasury reports, however, refer entirely to gold; our standard on which we measure values is gold; all of our Liberty bond issues are gold obligations; the larger part of the securities maturing at various times—nearly \$800,000,000 of them falling due within the current year—are gold obligations and call for the payment of the indebtedness evidenced by the securities in gold coin of the present standard of weight and fineness, or some equivalent expression. So, for the purpose of discussing this bill, we must consider it on the gold-standard basis, and I am asking, in the event these vast powers are centered in the hands of a Secretary of the Treasury at some time in the future who is in favor of disturbing the existing standard, what the necessary effect of it would be on the credit of the country? That is one of the reasons why I hesitate, even in time of war, to concentrate in the hands of a single official, however wise now, these vast powers.

There are a number of sections in this bill upon which I would greatly like to comment, Mr. President, but I shall content myself with the few general remarks that I have submitted on the objectionable features of this bill as they appear to me. I can not support it although I wish to say, for the information of the Senators, that nearly every public-utility man from my section of the country has wired me to support this bill. They have stated that they will not be able to take up their maturing obligations unless the Government helps them. Well, for my part, before voting for such a measure as this I would rather vote for a moratorium and stay the collection of debts in proper cases while the war is in progress. I think that would be attended

with less risk than the vesting of such tremendous powers in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury.

#### REGISTRATION FOR MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration two very important joint resolutions which have been reported by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, who is ill. These measures are very much needed so that the Judge Advocate General may carry on the draft.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I understand from the Senator from New Jersey that the joint resolutions to which he refers are very urgent, and that he thinks they can be disposed of in 15 minutes and that there will be practically no debate and no objection to them. I am perfectly willing to have the unfinished business laid aside so that the Senator may call up these joint resolutions, with the understanding that if debate develops lasting more than 15 or 20 minutes the joint resolutions are to be withdrawn.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I shall be very glad to withdraw my request for the consideration of the joint resolutions if action upon them takes longer than that time. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Senate first consider Senate joint resolution No. 124.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has heard the request of the Senator from New Jersey and also the explanation of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think it is necessary that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that that course be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to make that suggestion. A request for unanimous consent being made that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside, and the Chair hearing no objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 244, being Senate joint resolution No. 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from New Jersey having been heard, and the Chair hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, instead of considering first Senate joint resolution No. 123, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) providing for the registration for military service of all male persons citizens of the United States or residing in the United States who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe under the terms of the act approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States."

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. NEW. I do not understand what disposition, if any, was made of Senate joint resolution No. 124. I understood the Senator from New Jersey to call up that joint resolution, and now I understand that he calls up another. Is Senate joint resolution No. 124 before the Senate?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I corrected the request, and asked to substitute Senate joint resolution No. 124 for Senate joint resolution No. 123 as the one to be first considered. Senate joint resolution No. 124 is now before the Senate, as I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair begs pardon of the Senator from Utah. The Chair has not responded to the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Indiana. As the Chair has not information on the subject of the inquiry, if the information imparted by the Senator from New Jersey is satisfactory, then the Chair will take that as an answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. NEW. The Senator from Indiana understands that Senate joint resolution 124 is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands; it is. Now, in response to the request of the Senator from Utah, the joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in section 2, page 3, line 2, after the word "act," to insert:

*Provided*, That students who are preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools at the time of the approval of this act shall be exempt from the selective draft prescribed in the act of May 18, 1917; and that students entering such theological or divinity schools after the approval of this act and during the continuance of the

war, and who would be subject to any future registration as provided for in this act, may upon the recommendation or request of the president or dean of such school be exempt from the selective draft by order of the President.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.,* That all male persons, citizens of the United States or residing in the United States, who have, since the 5th day of June, 1917, and on or before the day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, attained the age of 21 years, shall be subject to registration in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, and that upon proclamation by the President, stating the time and place of such registration, it shall be the duty of all such persons, except such persons as in said proclamation may be exempted from registration, to present themselves for and submit to registration under the provisions of the act approved May 18, 1917, and they shall be registered in the same manner and subject to the same requirements and liabilities as those previously registered under the terms of said act.

SEC. 2. That after the day set under section 1 hereof for the registration by proclamation by the President at such intervals as the President may from time to time prescribe, the President may require that all male persons, citizens of the United States or residing in the United States, who have attained the age of 21 years since the last preceding date of registration, and on or before the next day set for the registration by proclamation by the President, except such persons as in the proclamation by the President stating the time and place of such registration may be exempted from registration, shall be registered in the same manner and subject to the same requirements and liabilities as those previously registered under the terms of said act: *Provided*, That students who are preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools at the time of the approval of this act shall be exempt from the selective draft prescribed in the act of May 18, 1917; and that students entering such theological or divinity schools after the approval of this act and during the continuance of the war, and who would be subject to any future registration as provided for in this act, may upon the recommendation or request of the president or dean of such school be exempt from the selective draft by order of the President.

SEC. 3. That all such persons when registered shall be liable to military service and to draft under the terms of said act approved May 18, 1917, under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of said act.

SEC. 4. That all such persons shall be subject to the terms and provisions and liabilities of said act approved May 18, 1917, in all respects as if they had been registered under the terms of said act, and every such person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of said act and of this joint resolution upon the publication of any such proclamation by the President.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, was that the last proviso just read?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It was.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is the committee amendment?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes. It provides that students preparing for the ministry shall be exempted.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Why should they be exempted in this hour of trial of the Government? Is that in the original act?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes; it is in the original act, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. That in addition to the persons subject to registration and selective draft under the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, all male persons between the ages of 19 and 30, both inclusive, shall be subject to registration and draft in accordance with the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That all registered male persons who have attained the age of 19 years shall be subject to military training in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, but shall not be called for active service until they have attained the age of 21 years.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I understand that the chairman of the Finance Committee [Mr. SIMMONS] would object to laying aside the finance bill for so long a time as would probably be necessary for the proper consideration of this amendment. There are some things that I should like to say concerning it myself, which might require some little time. I think there are other Senators on the floor who would like to be heard also. If time can be given for its proper consideration now, I am prepared to go ahead with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand from the Senator from Indiana that he desires to know whether more time than 15 minutes is to be conceded by the chairman of the Finance Committee, or does the Senator from Indiana merely give notice that he wishes to take up this matter without regard to the regular time of discussion?

Mr. NEW. The Senator from North Carolina is absent from the Chamber at this moment. I suggest that he be informed of the situation.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say, Mr. President, that the Senator from North Carolina agreed to let us take up these matters with the understanding that only a limited time would be devoted to

them. I do not know how much time the Senator from Indiana will require, but he certainly can go on until the Senator from North Carolina comes in.

Mr. SIMMONS entered the Chamber.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was wondering if the Senator from Indiana would not allow us to pass the joint resolution without insisting on that amendment at this time?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. NEW. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My agreement with the chairman of the Finance Committee is that if the discussion of these joint resolutions takes more than 15 minutes, I shall move that they go over. In view of the fact that this very important amendment has been offered to this joint resolution, and it will lead to extended debate, unless the Senator from Indiana will agree to withdraw the amendment I shall have to move that the joint resolution lie over; but I hope he will consent to withdraw it, for this reason:

At this time the Judge Advocate General is preparing to call the next draft, and this joint resolution provides that the men who have become 21 years of age since June 5 last shall be included in the new registration for the draft, in order that it may be more properly apportioned. It is a very important joint resolution, and the introduction of the amendment by the Senator from Indiana may lead to several days' delay. I do hope that he will consent to withdraw the amendment in order that we may pass the joint resolution at this time.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. NEW. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I agree with the substance of the amendment; but I think it would be better if the Senator would consent to withdraw it at this time and get the other part of the joint resolution in motion, in consideration of what the Senator from New Jersey has said. It is imperative to have the original portion of the joint resolution acted upon at once.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I hesitate to withdraw this amendment. I concede the importance of the joint resolution. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I think I realize just what it provides for. I agree with the Senator from New Jersey that the withdrawal of my amendment might save several days' time, but I think that the adoption of the amendment I have offered may ultimately save several months' time. I think that had the provisions of this amendment been law two or three years ago the war in which the United States is now engaged would have been ended in favor of the United States and its allies some time ago.

I feel, Mr. President, that I can not accede to the request to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield the floor, or does he yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. NEW. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Under those circumstances I ask that the joint resolution lie over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the joint resolution returned to the calendar?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I move that it be returned to the calendar; yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, such will be the course.

CALLING INTO MILITARY SERVICE CERTAIN PERSONS LIABLE THERETO.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I ask the Senate take up for consideration Senate joint resolution No. 123.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) providing for the calling into immediate military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 2, after the word "for," to insert "military"; on the same line, after the word "act," to strike out "approved May 18, 1917"; in line 7, after the word "classes," to strike out "from any State" and insert "except those exempt from draft under the provisions of said act"; in line 9, after the word "classes," to strike out the

comma and insert "in the various subdivisions of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the terms of said act"; in line 12, after the word "immediate," to insert "military" and in the same line, after the word "service," to insert "persons classed as," so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.,* That if under any regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," are placed in classes for the purpose of determining their relative liability for military service, no provision of said act shall prevent the President from calling for immediate military service under regulations heretofore or hereafter prescribed by the President all or part of the persons in any class or classes, except those exempt from draft under the provisions of said act, in proportion to the total number of persons placed in such class or classes, in the various subdivisions of the States, Territories and the District of Columbia designated by the President under the terms of said act: or from calling into immediate military service persons classed as skilled experts in industry or agriculture, however classified or wherever residing.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from New Jersey if this joint resolution takes care of the situation which arose from the fact that in many communities throughout the land the number of aliens was excessive, and that under the original act the burden of the draft has fallen very heavily upon these communities?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I understand that that is one of the purposes of the joint resolution.

Mr. CALDER. I am very glad that the Military Affairs Committee has asked for the consideration of this measure. It is a matter of very great importance and ought to have immediate action before the new draft goes into effect.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution providing for the calling into military service of certain classes of persons registered and liable for military service under the terms of the act of Congress approved May 18, 1917, entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.'"

#### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Harding	Nugent	Sterling
Beckham	Hardwick	Overman	Stone
Borah	Henderson	Owen	Sutherland
Calder	Hollis	Page	Thomas
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Thompson
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Polindexter	Tillman
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Saulsbury	Townsend
Dillingham	Kellogg	Shafroth	Trammell
Fernald	Kendrick	Sheppard	Vardaman
Fletcher	Knox	Sherman	Wadsworth
France	Lewis	Simmons	Warren
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Gerry	McCumber	Smith, Md.	Weeks
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	Williams
Gronna	New	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott
Hale	Norris	Smoot	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], by reason of illness.

Mr. LEWIS. Let me announce the absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] upon official business. I also announce the absence of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] and of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] because of illness.

Mr. NORRIS. I have been requested to announce that both the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] are absent from the city in attendance upon the funeral of the wife of the senior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on account of illness in his family.

Mr. KNOX. I have been requested to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAM-

BERLAIN] on account of illness, and the absence of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] on account of official business.

Mr. HOLLIS. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent on official business, and that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness; also that the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is necessarily detained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

#### WAR FINANCE CORPORATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will report the first amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The first amendment passed over was in section 5, on page 4, line 3, after the words "of the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; in line 4, after the word "provided," to strike out "shall devote their entire time to the business of the corporation (except such part of their time, if any, as shall be devoted to other governmental business) and"; in line 10, after the word "not," to strike out "however"; in the same line, after the word "exceeding," to strike out "the annual salary of the principal officer of an executive department of the United States" and insert "\$12,000"; in line 14, after the words "from the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; in line 18, after the words "by the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; in line 19, after the words "of the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; in line 22, before the words "shall designate," to strike out "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert "President of the United States"; in line 23, after the word "years," to strike out "No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation or member of any firm of bankers; and, before" and insert "Any director shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States"; on page 5, line 4, before the word "entering," to insert "Before"; and in line 5, after the word "shall," to strike out "certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he has complied with this requirement, and shall also," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That the four directors of the corporation appointed as hereinbefore provided shall receive annual salaries, payable monthly, the amount of which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President of the United States, not exceeding \$12,000. Any director receiving from the United States any salary or compensation for services shall not receive as salary from the corporation any amount which, together with any salary or compensation received from the United States, would make the total amount paid to him by the United States and by the corporation exceed the amount fixed as the annual salary of a director of the corporation, as hereinbefore provided. Of the four directors appointed, as hereinbefore provided, the President of the United States shall designate two to serve for two years, and two for four years; and thereafter each director so appointed shall serve for a term of four years. Any director shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States. Before entering upon his duties, each director and officer shall take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office. But nothing contained in this act or in the Federal reserve act shall be construed to prevent the appointment of a member of the Federal Reserve Board or of any other governmental administrative body or of a director of a Federal reserve bank as a director of the corporation.

Mr. HOLLIS. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina, what reason moved the committee to make that change in the original draft?

Mr. SIMMONS. The only reason that presented itself to the committee that I know was that it was not usual, although it has been done, I think, in one case, in the case of the Federal reserve banks, to provide that a Federal officer should give his entire time to the work. That might mean that he could not take the time that was necessary to attend to some incidental business matter. It might mean that he would have to devote his time so exclusively to this work that he would not be able to attend to those business matters to which every man must give more or less time.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, on this side of the aisle we can not hear the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. I said the reason for striking out that part of the section as well as striking out the subsequent provisions of the section which relates to holding a permanent position in other corporations was that with those provisions in the Secretary of the Treasury may find himself unable to secure suitable men for these positions. If a director was required to give his entire time to this work, if he is required to give up his connec-

tion as a director of every other corporation or bank or trust company, it might require such great sacrifices on his part that the Secretary would not be able to secure competent men to perform the service. These directors, the committee thought, ought to be men of large familiarity with the financial business conditions of the country. That class of men generally have a great many connections with business enterprises of the country. The requirement to separate themselves entirely from every business connection, so far as occupying an official position in connection with the corporations through which that business is conducted, is coupled with the requirement that they shall give their sole and exclusive time to this work. I was impressed, and I think the committee were impressed, with the thought that it would be very difficult to get the class of men we all ought to want on this board. That is the only reason I know of.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, that would be true with reference to members of the Federal Reserve Board as well, would it not?

Mr. SIMMONS. I stated that there was one instance in which Congress has required that the officer should give his entire time, and I referred to the directors of the Federal Reserve Board, but I am not aware that that has been the custom in creating offices. That is the only instance that has been brought to my attention in which that provision has been coupled with the qualifications of a man for an official position.

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator if he does not think it would be better, even if we had to pay a large salary of, say, \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year to these men, and to provide that no one who is connected with a commercial institution or is a director of a commercial institution shall hold this position? I heard the speech of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] on yesterday, and I was very much impressed with his statement that in his opinion it would inspire confidence among all the people of this country to have men appointed to this responsible position who were disassociated from the large commercial institutions.

Does not the Senator think it would be wiser to increase the salary of these men, and then prohibit the appointment of men who are active directors of banking and other financial institutions?

Mr. SIMMONS. I would agree with the Senator if we could secure suitable men who would be willing to abridge their personal rights with reference to their business matters to the extent that this provision would abridge it. I think it would be better, but I doubt very much whether you could procure in that way the right class of men.

I wish to say to Senators that, so far as I am concerned, after stating the reasons which the committee had for striking out these provisions of the bill, if the Senate sees fit to insert them I shall myself make no further opposition.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] that if this corporation was to be a permanent affair, if it was the same as the Federal Reserve Board, to exist for 50 years or more, I would be in favor of the original wording of the bill. But this is only a temporary organization.

Mr. OWEN. I remind the Senator that he is overlooking the fact that the term is limited to 10 years.

Mr. SMOOT. I call 10 years a temporary position.

Mr. OWEN. Not for a Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. Not for a Senator, but for a business man, who has an established business, a calling in life and knows nothing else but that one line of business. It is a temporary position, and I wish to say that even it may not last for 10 years under the provisions of the bill. The war may cease next year, and the declaration may be made by the President that it has ceased, and then the affairs of this concern would be wound up before the end of 10 years. If only a temporary organization, we should secure the very best men there are in the United States as members of the board of the corporation. I do not believe that we ought to put a provision in the bill that will limit the number of men from which selections can be made and virtually say that any man who has made a notable success in his line of business shall not be a member of this board. That is why I favor striking out the provision that was written in the bill by the framers of the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to ask the Senator a question,

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. GRONNA. Admitting it is true, as the Senator has stated, that this is only a temporary position, is there any reason to believe that we can not find men among these great financiers who are patriotic enough to devote at least a part of their time during the war to financing the country?

Mr. SMOOT. The director in the corporation could not devote only a part of his time, because the wording is that they shall devote their entire time to the business.

Mr. GRONNA. I suppose it means that they should devote all their time while they were holding the position as director in the corporation. I did not mean to intimate that they should only serve a part of the time during the period they would act as a director; but is it not reasonable to suppose that there are hundreds, yes, thousands, of men in this country who have made a financial success who do not require making any more money, who have sufficient, and who are also willing to sacrifice, if need be, in order to win this war. We have more than 100,000,000 people in this country, and with all the millionaires and billionaires we have to-day, is it not possible to find some one willing to give time to this important institution for the benefit of the whole country and not for private parties or corporations? I say, if we are in such a deplorable condition that the men who made these fortunes are unwilling to sacrifice at least a few years of their time and contribute their time not even as a gratuity but for reasonable pay, I believe we are in a very dangerous position, and I do not think we ought to enact the bill at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that there are thousands of financiers in the country who are perfectly willing to give their time to the Government during this war period and there are thousands of them who are giving their time to the Government now at a compensation of a dollar a year. But, Mr. President, we have heard on the floor of the Senate criticism time and time again against the Government accepting the services of these so-called captains of industry without compensation, and we have heard Senators from time to time say that no man ought to be employed by the Government of the United States and placed in a responsible position, as they are placed in to-day, without the Government paying for their services.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The men who will perform this function will be paid a salary. I do not understand that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] asks that they do this service for nothing, but he objects to men performing this particular duty when in the performance of that duty the public interests and their private interests may clash; we all realize that however honest a man may be—

Where self the wavering balance shakes  
'Tis rarely right adjusted.

It is not fair to the man appointed to place him in a position where he is called upon to decide this delicate question of propriety, nor is it altogether fair to the public.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say in answer to the Senator that I do not believe the President of the United States will select a man with no more honesty in his make-up than to accept such a position and then stoop so low as to take advantage of it, but I believe he will select men in whom the people have confidence and whom the President has confidence, and the Senate must have confidence in them, for the Senate will be asked to confirm their nomination.

The original wording it seems to me would cast reflection upon a man who might be selected as a director. Under the Senate amendment we broaden the number of persons from which the selections can be made. We make it just as broad as possible so that the President of the United States can nominate any man in the United States as a director. I do not believe there is a single man in the United States who has brains enough to fill such a position who would refuse to accept the nomination if requested to by the President.

But it is said he should be required to devote his entire time to the corporation. Suppose he went off for a week end or took a rest for a week, it is just like many people in the United States to find fault with him and say he is violating the law. If there was a necessity for such a requirement I would be in favor of it. If it was a permanent organization I would be in favor of it. But, Mr. President, it is a temporary appointment and I do not believe that you ought to ask men who are now engaged in business, and no doubt a lifelong business, to give it up entirely, or if perchance they are directors in a corporation and have been perhaps from the inception of the business and have seen the business grow, I do not believe

they ought to be asked to resign as a director in a corporation because they are asked to serve as a director of this corporation if the work required does not conflict. If they are men whom you can not trust do not appoint them, and if such men are appointed let the Senate refuse to confirm them.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the services that will be required under this act will be the services of those who are peculiarly acquainted with financial conditions in the United States. Those who will be selected must necessarily be from a class who are so acquainted and who have the ability to bring to the service of the Government the greatest possible knowledge upon that particular subject. It was the purpose of the amendment to so widen the scope of the field of opportunity for the President himself to make a selection of men with the greatest degree of capability who would fill these places.

Every Senator knows that to-day the men who have the greatest knowledge of these subjects are as a rule either presidents or vice presidents or members of a board of directors. They are the men who are alive and doing the business of the country to-day. Why should the President say to a man who is upon the board of directors of a great financial institution, "You must get off this board." Possibly that board may need his services; it may not be for more than one day in a month, and yet it needs his services. But without this amendment you would say to him, "We can not accept your services if you are to give even one day a month at a meeting of your directors to look after your own institution." I do not believe the country is going to suffer by reason of a member of this board taking a day off to attend to the private business of a director. I believe the chances are that the President may not be able to secure exactly the kind of men he needs to fill these positions unless he be given the opportunity to select from presidents or vice president or directors of any corporation.

There is no Senator here who gives his entire attention to the business of the country. Every one of them has his own private business to look after to some extent. I do not believe that the country suffers because he has private business to look after. On the contrary, I think if he had no business to look after he would hardly be fit to hold a place in the Senate or to hold any other position.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we broaden the field of opportunity and give the President a scope of opportunity to select just the class of men he wants, and he wants the very best there are in the land. We ought not to say to him, "You can not select such a man unless you compel him to resign from the directorship of a banking institution which he assists in controlling."

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, there are two parts of this proposed amendment. The first is that these directors shall devote their entire time to the business of the corporation. That has been stricken out by the committee. It is assumed by striking it out that they could manage this corporation with four thousand five hundred million dollars of property by giving only a part of their time. Probably the biggest bank in the United States has a capital of \$50,000,000, with assets possibly running up as high as six or seven hundred million dollars, but this bank will start off with \$500,000,000 of actual capital drawn out of the Treasury of the United States, and then will have the authority to raise four thousand million dollars, or eight times as much, by bonds. These funds, moreover, will partake of the nature of a revolving fund. It will not be limited to the four thousand five hundred million dollars. It may be converted into revolving funds and involve a larger line of activities.

The work being laid out here, while expressed in a few words, is perfectly gigantic. I think Senators ought not to fail to observe that we are imposing upon these men a duty which obviously must require all of the time of whoever devotes himself to it. So much for the first part of the amendment.

The second part which the amendment proposes to strike out is that no director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation or member of any firm of bankers. I do not think it turns so much upon the honesty of the man as that he shall be able to give his time to the gigantic labor which is contemplated by the bill.

It does not avail to say that we will select honest men and therefore there is no necessity for requiring all their time to be given. It is better, indeed, as a public policy, to have men in charge of such a high function not swayed by private interest. I think it would suffice, probably, to say that they should not continue as active officers, leaving the question of the possibility of their having a private interest which might interfere with the discharge of their functions to be passed upon by those who consider the question of the nomination. But I am very

sure that the entire time will be required of those who undertake to handle this gigantic institution, the biggest institution, probably, in the world, as a banking establishment. The Bank of England has a deposit of only \$1,000,000,000. Here is one that will have funds to handle four times as great. The days are short; there are only 8 or 10 hours in an ordinary working day in which a man can judiciously apply himself to intellectual labor. I think it would be a serious mistake to deal with this question as a matter requiring only a part of the time.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I opposed the amendment that is proposed here by the committee when it was before the committee at the time, and inasmuch as it is about to be voted upon I feel like stating the reasons which actuated me at the time to offer such opposition. It was not because I feared the honesty of the men who might be selected, but rather because I felt that this is a most unusual law. We are conferring power about which I think every Senator has some doubt. I think there are very few Senators who look with perfect complacency upon this legislation; but we are all forced to support it, because we think an emergency has arisen and now confronts us which requires perhaps that extraordinary powers should be exerted through this corporation. Already it has been subject to the criticism that it might do things which would result disastrously. We all know that there is criticism more or less extant throughout the United States of the system of appointing men to high positions who are interested in the subject matter or similar subject matter to those dealt with under the proposed statute. It therefore seemed to me that it was the wise plan to avoid all suspicion as far as possible. I believe that any man who will be selected for this position, no matter what his position may be and how important it may be, will be willing for the public good to divest himself of interest in other concerns in order that he may render the most efficient service possible on this board. It was, therefore, more as a matter of policy with me than anything else, that I thought and I think now it is wise to consider in legislation of this magnitude; and that the provision of the bill itself is better than the one proposed by the committee.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I devoted some time yesterday to explaining the bill to the Senate and pointing out some of the dangers that I saw in it. I called the corporation to be established under the bill a bank, and it is a bank. No one denies it; but for some reason the friends of the measure are afraid to call it a bank and insist upon calling it by some more euphonious title.

The bill was brought here by the Secretary of the Treasury, so I am informed, and it was referred to the Committee on Finance. It is to be assumed that the bill was drawn about as the Secretary of the Treasury wanted it. I have not heard anyone argue enthusiastically for the bill in any particular. Those who are for it are for it with much apology, and with very little explanation of its need. It is a bad bill, and the only reason it is excusable is because there is a bad situation. I hope the Senate will make it as palatable for those of us who do not approve of it as is possible.

Now, here is a great bank, with powers never before granted to any bank in the United States or probably anywhere else. It is to be put in the sole charge of five directors, of whom the Secretary of the Treasury is one. The time of the Secretary of the Treasury is absorbed in matters of great importance. The duties involved in the handling of the business of the Treasury alone are more than one man can fairly cope with in war times, and the present Secretary of the Treasury has many other functions. He is the chairman of the Farm Loan Board; he is the Director General of the Railroads of the country. He may, therefore, be safely left out of the reckoning so far as sitting on this board of bank directors is concerned. All he can do will be to suggest general policies.

The men who are called to handle this great bank will be called to a position of great honor and of tremendous responsibility. I have no idea where the men will be found. It is suggested by the Senator from Utah that they will be great experts in financial affairs. They ought not to be. They should be merchants, as are the directors of the Bank of England. England will not permit its captains of finance to be on the directorate of its one great bank. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] said last week, finance should be the handmaiden of commerce and not the director of commerce. This bank is to serve the commercial interests of the United States, and through the commercial interests to serve us all. Financiers should be disqualified from being on this board at all, but the Senators who argue that they should not lay aside their financial duties and private interests evidently think they must be financiers. If they are to be financiers, if there are no other men in the

country who are fit to sit on the board of this bank, it is because the duties of the bank require remarkable services. If the duties of the bank require remarkable services, those services should be rendered solely to the bank.

I referred yesterday to the fact that these men must be super-financiers. I meant by that that they must be above the ordinary financiers. Even though they have other important duties, they should gladly lay aside those duties and come to the call of their country. I suspect that some of those who favor this phraseology have in mind men who they think are solely fitted to run the affairs of this great bank, and that those men have been seen and have said that they will not give up their private business. I suspect that; I am afraid of it.

If the Secretary of the Treasury wanted the bill drawn in this way, and if the Secretary of the Treasury insists on having this bill passed granting these tremendous powers, then the wishes of the Secretary of the Treasury ought to be respected by the Senate, for the Secretary of the Treasury is going to be gauged by this measure. For myself I do not believe it will be a success. I think that hereafter Senators and members of the administration will be trying to evade responsibility for it. But let us give it the fairest possible chance; let us treat the proposed corporation like a great bank, as we treated the Federal Reserve Banking System; let us throw the safeguards around these men that we threw around the members of the Federal Reserve Board; and I ask the Senate, since no one or very few seem to care particularly about this Senate committee amendment, to vote it down and to restore the bill to its original form.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not care to enter into any further discussion with respect to this amendment, but I do want to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the fact that the prohibition to which he refers is not confined to officers and directors of banks alone, as his remarks would imply, or at least would seem to imply. It is broader and provides that—

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

It does not make any difference whether or not it is a financial corporation; no man who happens to be a director of a business corporation is eligible under that language. A merchant whose business has been incorporated would be disqualified under that language.

If the purpose of the Senator from New Hampshire in offering this amendment is to dissociate the directors of this corporation from interests that might possibly be affected by their action as members of the corporation, he will not accomplish that purpose by simply saying that they shall not be directors of any other corporation. In order to accomplish that purpose, if that is his purpose—and it seems to be—he will have to provide that they shall give up any business in which they have an interest in any corporation or any bank or any other concern which happens to be operating under charter. If they are required to give up their business, then, of course, their selfish interest will be removed if it conflicts in the slightest with their duties as directors; but simply to require them to cease to be directors of corporations does not reach the object.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GERRY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I desire to suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill that the end of securing the time of the members of this board could be accomplished simply by putting in the word "active," providing that they shall not continue to be active directors, and so forth; that their time shall not be taken up with other employments of this kind.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course that would improve it very much.

Mr. OWEN. Because, after all, a man who has his properties invested need not be a director or an officer. A man may own a bank as a stockholder and may name every officer and employee in that bank and control its policy without being an officer or a director. Everybody knows that. Therefore, at last we have got to rely upon the integrity of mind of those who are put upon this board. I think, in view of the gigantic proportions of the establishment, with \$4,500,000,000 to be disposed of by it as a banking institution, the men who compose the board of directors ought to give all of their time to its duties. I think the public interest requires that they give all of their time to their duties when the United States puts such an enormous trust in the hands of any men. They ought not to be able to treat it negligently and to give only a fraction of their time to the discharge of their duties.

Mr. SIMMONS. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma with reference to their giving at least a sufficient portion of

their time to the discharge of their duties; all the time that is necessary to efficiently discharge the duties ought to be given; but even when this language is stricken out they will be under the same obligation and responsibility to their consciences and to the Government of giving to this office such time as is adequate for the official discharge of its duties.

We do not, Mr. President, in creating an office say that the official shall give his entire time to it, and yet we all understand whenever a man is appointed to a Federal office that he assumes the obligation of giving to the discharge of the duties of that office all the time that is necessary properly to perform those duties. It is not necessary to write that into the law; it is implied.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do.

Mr. OWEN. I wish to observe to the Senator that when the bill comes into the Senate with the very reasonable requirement that the entire time of the directors of this corporation shall be devoted to their public duties and then the Senate strikes it out of the bill, it is equivalent to putting an interpretation upon the bill that their entire time will not be required.

Mr. SIMMONS. It is stricken out because such a requirement is not ordinarily demanded and striking out the provision puts these officers, I think, upon a parity with every other officer of the United States Government to-day with the solitary exception of the provisions which are contained in the Federal reserve act.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina will agree with me that there would be very serious objection to a provision of that kind applying to ourselves or to Members of the other House of Congress.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yet we are expected to perform all the duties that are incumbent upon us.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish only to say in addition, Mr. President, that the remark of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] seemed to imply that members of the Finance Committee and other Senators had no interest in this matter. I myself am in favor of the amendment of the committee. The remark I made when I first had the floor upon the amendment, to the effect that the Senate could deal with it as it pleased, simply meant to convey to the Senate the idea that whatever the Senate might do with reference to this amendment would be accepted as satisfactory.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I wish to say merely a few words on this question. I want to compliment the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] on what he said just as he sat down, when he expressed a willingness to abide by what the Senate might do. It is a relief to know that all of us are absolutely free to vote as we see fit on this amendment; but it does seem to me, Mr. President, that we ought to remember in passing on this amendment, and on all other amendments to this bill, that there is not anything like this bill on the statute books of any country in the world. There is hardly anything with which we can compare it. To my mind it is not fair to compare the duties of the directors of the proposed corporation to the duties of ordinary directors and presidents and other officials of corporations and of banks, because the importance of the greatest of corporations and the largest of banks sinks into insignificance when we compare it with the colossal proposition that is presented before us in this bill. These directors will have charge not of a bank doing an ordinary banking business or a corporation doing the ordinary business of a corporation, but they will have something to do with all of the corporations, with all of the banks, and with all of the business of all of the country. It is the most gigantic proposition that ever was conceived of; it is one that all of us stand almost in awe of; and yet we feel that something of the kind ought to be provided by law.

It is not an aspersion upon any man or upon his honesty or his patriotism to say that when he takes a position on the board of directors of this great institution he ought to give up active connection with any other corporation or any other bank as a manager or officer of any kind. That does not imply that we are suspicious of that man; but there are several reasons to my mind why he ought to be compelled so to do. First, the very magnitude of the undertaking. If he devotes all of his time every day to the work, he will not be able fully to comprehend all of the business of this great institution. The country ought to have all of his energy and all of his ability, and so his mind ought to be entirely divorced from private business, from the management of other corporations, or from the

control of any private banking institution, because he will deal with people engaged in that class of business.

It is said by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] that, even though he is not allowed to be a director or an officer of a corporation, he still may have an interest in a corporation. That may be true, and I can conceive how it might be possible that his private interests might even in that case come in conflict with his public duty; but I am not going on the theory that he would permit his private interests to control his public duty if he accepted this place. However, he will occupy a different position as a director of this corporation if he is only a stockholder in a bank than though he were president of that bank. If he be president of that bank, he has a responsibility resting on him that will take his time and his thought. Even though he may say, "I will not devote any time to it," his mind would advert to the business of that bank; it would be an impossibility for him to divorce himself entirely from its affairs, because he would know there was a responsibility on him. That would be natural and perfectly proper; but that responsibility he could not throw off, and he would not be quite so competent to serve on this great corporation in such a case as though his mind were perfectly free and had no responsibility of any kind in the control or management of any other bank or any other corporation.

There is another reason, Mr. President. The members of this board of directors ought, like Caesar's wife, to be free even of suspicion. They will come in contact with private institutions and private banking firms and corporations, and if they are officers or managers of such institutions their competitors will be suspicious, and even those who are not competitors with them in business will perhaps look with some degree of suspicion upon their activities as members of this great institution. We want and we need, Senators, the confidence of the country in this great corporation as much as in any institution ever created by law. We want the people from the very highest to the very lowest degree to believe and have faith that this great corporation is absolutely above everything except the welfare of our entire country and all the business of it. So we ought to free it if we can from any possibility of such suspicion.

Mr. President, it is said that if we provide that these men shall devote their entire time to this business and shall not be officers of any other corporation or managers of any other bank we will expect too much of a sacrifice; that it will be a sacrifice for a man to surrender his private position. That is true; it will be a sacrifice probably, but are we going to say that there is any man here in the United States who is not patriotic enough to make that sacrifice? We all make sacrifices. The boy in the trenches who gives up a salary of \$2,500 a year to go out as a mark for enemy bullets in a foreign land surrenders his position and takes another one at \$30 a month. He makes the sacrifice under the draft law, and we require many of our citizens to make the same sacrifice. Are we to say now that a great captain of industry, who is president of a bank, would, if selected by the President to fill a place on this board of directors, say "I can not make that sacrifice"? If he is not willing to make that sacrifice, Mr. President, he will not be a good member of the board of directors, and ought to be left off it. It is not as great a sacrifice as thousands of his fellow citizens make. To my mind, there will be no difficulty in that.

I am not charging that there are any such men; I do not believe that there are. Furthermore, these men are not working for \$30 a month or for a dollar a year. When they are appointed, under the terms of the bill the President will fix their salary, and there is only one limitation to the amount, and that is that the salary shall not exceed \$12,000 a year. It is safe to say that the President will fix the salary at \$12,000 a year. Is there any Senator who doubts it? The very passage of the bill with that provision in it is an invitation to the President to fix the salary at \$12,000 a year. So when it comes to the question of pecuniary sacrifice these men are not going to make such a great sacrifice, for they will get \$12,000 a year for their services, and if they get \$12,000 a year ought they not to devote all their time to this great institution?

Mr. President, it seems perfectly clear to me that this ought to be required as a matter of law; it ought to be in the bill. It will help to free the entire proposition of any lingering suspicion that might rest anywhere; it will help to give moral force to whatever acts this board or corporation may perform, because to the degree that it is humanly possible it will remove any possibility of any of these men doing officially what may profit them privately.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, when I discussed this question a moment ago I was not aware that there were two propositions involved in it. I was directing myself then, as I did

before the committee, to the last provision, the one at the bottom of page 4 and the top of page 5. I had no objection to striking out the words requiring these men to devote their whole time to this particular work, because I could not imagine a man appointed to this position if he were forbidden to serve any other interest outside, who would not devote to the task the time necessary to do the work. We do not generally apply such provisions to other officers, and, therefore, I can see no particular reason why those words should be left in. It seems to me they are superfluous. But what I was directing my attention to was the fact that we should require that these men during the time they are serving the Government should be divorced from any position of influence or profit which might be construed as interfering with their duties on this board.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I want to direct the attention of the Senate to the manner in which this question comes up. The bill originally contained the provision that the members of this bank board—

shall devote their entire time to the business of the corporation (except such part of their time, if any, as shall be devoted to other governmental business).

The question will be on the amendment. Now, by adopting the committee amendment we can not wipe the slate clean. If any question ever comes up under this bill as to whether a member of the board is allowed to conduct other businesses, this copy of the bill will be conclusive evidence to the court that passes on it that the Senate had the matter up and the Senate deliberately voted that these men might be allowed to engage in as many other businesses as they pleased. You can not wipe the slate clean in that way. I hope Senators will vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NORRIS (when the name of Mr. CUMMINS was called). I desire to announce the absence of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], and while I am on my feet I desire also to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]. Both Senators are absent in Iowa, attending the funeral of the wife of the senior Senator from that State. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who is absent on account of illness. I understand, however, that if he were present he would support the bill and the amendments reported by the committee, and I therefore feel at liberty to vote and vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], due to illness in his family. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I transfer the general pair which I have with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], who is necessarily absent. I am informed, however, that if he were present he would vote "yea"; and I desire to vote "yea," and therefore shall so vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I transfer my general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] to the junior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. BECKHAM. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. JAMES] on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. RANDELL. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BROUSSARD] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. HOLLIS. I have been requested to announce that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent on official business, and that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. McNARY. I announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. WATSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WELCH].

I voted and have since discovered his absence from the Chamber. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], and will let my vote stand.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Do I understand that we are voting on two amendments?

Mr. LODGE. No; only one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are voting upon the first amendment.

Mr. LEWIS. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] is detained by illness. I also wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] are necessarily detained.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 32, as follows:

## YEAS—36.

Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Page	Smoot
Caldier	Kellogg	Ransdell	Swanson
Colt	Lewis	Robinson	Tillman
Dillingham	Lodge	Saulsbury	Townsend
Fernald	McNary	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Martin	Shields	Warren
France	Nelson	Simmons	Watson
Gallinger	New	Smith, Md.	Weeks
Gerry	Overman	Smith, S. C.	Williams

## NAYS—32.

Borah	Hardwick	Nugent	Smith, Mich.
Culberson	Henderson	Owen	Sterling
Curtis	Hollis	Pittman	Sutherland
Frellinghuysen	Johnson, S. Dak.	Polindexter	Thomas
Gore	Kendrick	Pomerene	Thompson
Gronna	Kirby	Reed	Trammell
Hale	Myers	Shafroth	Underwood
Harding	Norris	Sherman	Vardaman

## NOT VOTING—26.

Ashurst	Goff	Knox	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Hitchcock	La Follette	Smith, Ga.
Brandegee	James	McCumber	Stone
Broussard	Johnson, Cal.	McKellar	Walsh
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	McLean	Wolcott
Cummins	Kenyon	Penrose	
Fall	King	Phelan	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I desire to give notice now that I reserve the right to have a separate vote on this amendment when the bill reaches the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. On line 25, page 4, and lines 1 and 2, page 5, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation or member of any firm of bankers; and, before—

And to insert in lieu thereof:

Any director shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States. Before.

Mr. TOWNSEND. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I think the Senate ought not to vote on that entire amendment without a division. I think most of the Senate believes in the words to be added:

Any director shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States.

I think the question should come first on striking out the words:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation, or member of any firm of bankers.

I therefore ask to have the question divided.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the amendment of the committee in lines 3 and 4 is not a substitute for the other amendment, proposing to strike out certain words.

Mr. HOLLIS. No; it is not.

Mr. SMOOT. They are two separate and distinct propositions, and I think the Senator from New Hampshire is perfectly right.

Mr. SIMMONS. They ought to appear in the bill as two amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I ask for a vote on the first amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated.

The SECRETARY. Beginning on page 4, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the following words:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation or member of any firm of bankers; and, before.

Mr. NORRIS. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I move a substitute for that language, to read:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an active officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator state that amendment again? We could not hear him.

Mr. OWEN. I move a substitute, to read:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an active officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the proper way would be to vote upon the committee amendment, and then, if the committee amendment is agreed to, offer the amendment just suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 1, before the word "officer," it is proposed to insert the word "active."

Mr. OWEN. That was not my amendment, Mr. President. I move a substitute for the words to be stricken out, to read:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an active officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

Mr. SMOOT. That is offered as a substitute, Mr. President, and—

Mr. OWEN. The effect of it is to strike out and insert.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, may the substitute be stated, please?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the substitute.

The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be stricken out by the committee on page 4, line 25, and on lines 1 and 2, page 5, it is proposed to insert the following words:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an active officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. Assuming that this substitute shall be agreed to, would the amendment of the committee to strike out then be the next motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would; yes.

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I want to understand. If this amendment is agreed to, then the committee amendment has been disposed of.

SEVERAL SENATORS. No; it has not.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, let us have an understanding.

Mr. LODGE. The motion of the Senator from Oklahoma is a motion to strike out and insert; and if that motion is agreed to, the words offered by the Senator from Oklahoma go into the bill and stay there.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, as I understood, the Senator from Oklahoma offered his amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The committee amendment is a motion to strike out.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that. I think we all know that. Is that true, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the way the Chair understands the amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I make the point that that motion is improper, because, if that motion should prevail, it would do away entirely with the committee amendment to strike out, or it would substitute something else to be stricken out, and the motion to strike out would still be pending.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma shall be adopted it will be an amendment to the committee amendment. Then the question will recur upon the amendment as amended, as I understand.

Mr. OWEN. That is right.

Mr. NORRIS. But the committee amendment is to strike out certain words. The motion of the Senator from Oklahoma is a substitute for that, to strike out the same words and insert other words. Now, suppose that prevails: You have substituted something in the bill that the committee has moved to strike out, and it ends it, and you do not get a chance to vote on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; if the Senator will pardon me, the question then recurs on the amendment offered by the committee, which has been amended by the motion made by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, Rule XVIII of the Senate provides that a motion to strike out and insert one proposition shall not prevent a motion to strike out and insert a different proposition. I understand that that is the proposition of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the words which the Senator from Oklahoma desires to strike out are in the bill. The fact that the committee has recommended their amendment does not change that fact. Now, the Senator moves to strike out those words in the bill and to insert in lieu of them certain other words. If the Senate shall adopt that course, I take it that that would mean that the other words that he suggests would be inserted in the place of these. Having that view about it, I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is a good amendment, and I am perfectly willing to accept it, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? If the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma should prevail, would the bill then read as it read when it came from the House?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; with the change that he proposes.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. We would not have any opportunity at all then to vote upon the motion to strike out that part which came from the House.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, as I understand the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma, it is not to strike out, but it is to insert the word "active." If I understood the reading, that is all his amendment does. Now, of course the Senate has a right to amend the provision which it is proposed to strike out. Then the vote comes upon whether or not it shall be stricken out. Am I correct? Will the Senator from Oklahoma inform me whether he does more than simply insert a word?

Mr. OWEN. Yes. My amendment accepts the committee amendment which strikes out the words "or member of any firm of bankers," and would leave the language of the bill to read:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an active officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator does strike out the words following "corporation." Of course, then, that changes the situation. I thought the Senator had simply introduced the word "active."

Mr. OWEN. My amendment, in effect, would strike out the words following the word "corporation," namely, "or member of any firm of bankers; and, before."

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then, Mr. President, it should be clear that if the motion of the Senator should prevail that will dispose of the whole matter.

Mr. OWEN. It will.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma, of course, could adopt the course suggested by the Senator from Michigan and offer one or more perfecting amendments to the language proposed to be stricken out. He has not taken that course. He has taken a course which he is entitled to take, and which precedes a simple motion to strike out, and that is a motion to strike out and insert. A motion to strike out and insert obviously always takes precedence of a plain motion to strike out.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, while the Senator from Massachusetts is on the floor may I ask him a question?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. If the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma prevails, then will that portion of the bill which the committee proposes to strike out remain in the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. It will go out, and its place will be taken by the language proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; but then we will have no opportunity to pass upon the other proposition.

Mr. LODGE. No; except when the bill is in the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the substitute.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I should like to ask a question of the Senator who offers the substitute. He introduces into the bill the language "an active member." What does he mean by that?

Mr. OWEN. The purpose of my proposed amendment is that these men shall not have any other occupation to divert them from this service which we are putting upon them.

Mr. REED. But they could still be directors of a corporation.

Mr. OWEN. Oh, yes; they might own the corporation, and not be directors.

Mr. REED. One of them could still be the president of the corporation.

Mr. OWEN. Yes; and he might own the corporation and not be the president.

Mr. REED. I understand that.

Mr. OWEN. I am just seeking to provide by my amendment that a man's eligibility shall not be denied by his being an

officer, but shall depend upon the time he can give. I only propose precluding those whose time is otherwise engaged by being active officers of other corporations. Of course, he ought not to pass on a case where his own interests are involved.

Mr. REED. But the Senator intends to allow him to retain that interest, and intends to allow him to retain an office also, in addition to that interest, provided he is not active in the office. The question I am raising is, what we gain by introducing the word "active."

Mr. OWEN. The intention was to gain time.

Mr. REED. Time?

Mr. OWEN. Yes. The aspect which the Senator has in mind is another aspect entirely.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. That is, the time that they can give.

Mr. OWEN. The time that they can give was all that I was trying to accomplish, because I do not think I can accomplish any more, if I can accomplish that much.

Mr. REED. I have this observation to make touching the amendment: It seems to concede that there should not be an outside interest that would interfere with the performance of the duties.

Mr. OWEN. I should hope so.

Mr. REED. And that, the Senator thinks, is a desirable thing to accomplish. The Senator wants to cut off outside interference, and he therefore proposes to say that an officer shall not be an active officer. Now, I do not think we gain anything by that.

If a man is an officer, he must in some way perform the duties of that office. If he is the president of a corporation, he must do something in that capacity. If he is the director of a corporation, he must do something in that capacity. We either ought to cut off their right to be concerned in the ownership of a corporation that has any business connection with this corporation, or else we ought to impose no restrictions at all, in my judgment.

I think that the proper restriction to place here is that this corporation shall not do any business with any other corporation if any of its members are officers or directors or substantial stockholders in such other corporation, and I should be glad to support such an amendment. I make this distinction: Here is a corporation that ought to call for a very high class of talent, and we can hardly expect to find that kind of talent unless we find the possessor of it to be also interested in the business affairs of the country; and I should dislike to deny to this corporation the employment of that character of talent. At the same time, however, I think it would be utterly wrong to permit this corporation to do any business with a corporation having officers or substantial stockholders represented as officers of this corporation. If this can take some such form that I can prepare such an amendment I will offer it, and I think the chairman of the committee probably would feel inclined to accept that proposition.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I ask permission to withdraw the amendment I proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma requests permission to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a moment. As I understood the Senator from Oklahoma to state that he would withdraw his amendment for the moment, and as I am in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma as against the amendment of the committee, I am going to vote against the amendment of the committee with the idea that the Senator from Oklahoma will offer his amendment later.

Mr. President, I want to say just a word in answer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. It is not the intention of this bill to advance money for banks to speculate upon or for public utilities to speculate upon. The object of this bill is to assist certain business corporations of this country to refund their bonded indebtedness and for extension of business necessary for the prosecution of the war; and the necessity for so doing is because the Government of the United States has monopolized the money market of the United States. I do not care how good a credit an institution may have in this country; if they have large issues of bonds falling due this year, they can not secure the money to meet them unless they get it through this or some similar corporation. It is an impossibility; I do not care what kind of credit they may have.

Do we want to penalize an institution by refusing assistance to it, which, if it should fail, may drag down other institutions to failure, because the President had appointed as director an officer or a member of the institution who had the attainments necessary to fill the position of director provided for in this bill. I do not believe Senators are going to take that position.

I am perfectly willing to say that the man appointed shall give the required time to the corporation. That would not include such a man as the cashier of a bank or a manager of a business. I think if there is a man preeminently qualified, who knows the value of the securities of this country, and the President of the United States wants him to serve as a member of the board, he should have the right to appoint him and not require him to resign, even if a director of another corporation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was engaged and did not quite hear the first part of the Senator's remarks. Did he say that there was a corporation that had \$10,000,000 of bonds coming due and that it could not renew its securities?

Mr. SMOOT. No; I did not put it that way, Mr. President. I stated that the Government of the United States has monopolized the money market in this country; that I care not what kind of security an institution may have if it has falling due a large issue of bonds, we might say twenty or thirty million dollars, it can not refund those bonds in the present condition of the money market unless we pass legislation along this line.

Mr. REED. Now, let us assume that there is such a corporation and it owes \$10,000,000 and can not refund. Of course, it might be unable to refund because of the reason the Senator gives. It might be unable to refund because its securities were questioned.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, if the securities are questioned, I want to say it could not refund under the bill.

Mr. REED. I know, but suppose the president and the principal owner of the corporation was one of these directors, does the Senator think he ought to pass upon the question of \$10,000,000 of security?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it is not a question of passing upon any particular \$10,000,000 advance.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator think he ought to pass on that \$10,000,000?

Mr. SMOOT. I think he could pass on that \$10,000,000, or he should never have been appointed by the President.

Mr. REED. Now, let me interject another question, so that the Senator can reply to all at once. Then the Senator is asserting the principle that has been repudiated by every court of equity and every writer of law who has ever lived, that a man may sit and deal with the public moneys for his own use and benefit.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator had heard what I said in the beginning, he would have known that this legislation is not for the purpose of advancing money for speculation. That would be quite a different proposition. Such legislation as this was unheard of before this world war. There is not a Senator in this body who a year ago would have thought for a minute of voting for such legislation. We are up against a condition, not a theory, and, Senators, the business interests of the country must receive relief or failures will become general.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will permit me, can you not so frame the law as to have it administered by men who will not take advantage of the law to promote their own private interests?

Mr. SMOOT. No such thing will happen under this provision. It is not a question now as to whether some director will want to save some particular business. It is a question of saving the business of the country as a whole. The question is for the Government of the United States to lend its credit to save all classes of business, for if any considerable number of them are allowed to fail, if one fails here and one fails there, unless assistance comes to business concerns of the country it will be like a house of cards, once beginning to fall it will all fall.

Mr. OWEN. Will the Senator permit me to suggest that the real amendment which is now before the Senate is not involved in the question raised by the Senator from Missouri, and we could take that up at a later time after we disposed of the matter which is now before the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Oklahoma is right. The only reason why I made the statement I did was in answer to a statement the Senator from Missouri made.

Mr. OWEN. I should like to suggest that it would be perfectly easy to provide that no member of this board should pass upon questions in which his corporation was interested, and that would probably meet the point of view of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SMOOT. It may be for the public interest to save the institution that one member of this board was interested in. It may be an institution that, if it was allowed to fail, would be the beginning of a panic in the United States; and that must not be allowed. The business institutions of the country would not require assistance in ordinary times, but the situation, and every Senator knows it, is that the Government of the United States has monopolized entirely the money market of the United

States and will do so as long as this war lasts, thus preventing money flowing in its regular channels.

While I am on my feet I may say this, Mr. President, that if the war lasts two more years I look for this corporation to advance money to institutions upon securities that would not be considered adequate in ordinary times. The situation is serious, and as long as the Government of the United States has credit she dare not allow business institutions to begin to fail in large numbers, because if such a thing is allowed there will be a financial catastrophe, and the credit of our Nation will be impaired. You must not think for a minute that if the war continues for another year we will not be running the institutions of this country and paying the debts of our Government by paper money. Inflation will be the order of the day, as every other Government involved in this war to-day is running upon inflated currency.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.  
Mr. GRONNA. Is it not true that this bill means inflation?

Mr. SMOOT. Before we really have actual inflation I will say there would have to be an amendment to the Federal reserve act, because the Federal reserve act limits the issue of paper money to \$2,500,000,000, with a 40 per cent gold reserve back of all issues. But I have no more question but that limit will be increased than that I stand here, if the war continues another year. It is then that actual inflation will take place. Actual inflation will take place before we ever reach the \$4,500,000,000 limit provided for in this bill; but, as I said, that can not happen until the present Federal reserve law is amended.

With the statement I have made I am perfectly willing now to vote against the amendment offered by the committee, with the hope that the Senator from Oklahoma will renew his motion to amend. I am willing to vote for his amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the vehemence of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] is directed against the general financial condition and not to the proposition under discussion. He tells us that we are in a very bad way; that we are liable to become bankrupt; that the Government has withdrawn all the money from the country; that there is no money that can be obtained in the open market with which to finance institutions.

Mr. SMOOT. Credit, I said.

Mr. REED. Very well, the credit. Then the Senator says because that is the case we ought to permit men financially interested in dealings with the Federal corporation we are about to create to sit as members of that corporation and make dealings with themselves. The two propositions are entirely separate propositions. One is the financial condition of the country. That may be as bad as the Senator thinks and it may not be. The necessity for this bill may be very great, and I think we nearly all concede that the necessity is great; but in constructing the bill, in determining what safeguards shall be thrown about the bill, it seems to me that we can decide that question on its merits, and we should not confuse it with the question which the Senator from Utah so eloquently discussed.

Now, what is the question? Stated in plain, blunt language, it is this: Shall a man sit upon the board of directors of this Federal corporation, that is to loan the people's money and at the same time sit with a board of directors of a corporation that is to borrow the people's money from the Federal corporation? In other words, shall he do business with himself? It does not make any difference how great the financial emergency may be; that affords no excuse or reason for permitting a man who is a member of this board to loan our money, the people's money, to himself.

There are plenty of men who can be found who will transact this business for the country who will not find it necessary to borrow or to have dealing with the Government through this corporation, but if it is thought that a restriction which would forbid any man to be a director of the Federal corporation who is at the same time the director of any other corporation is thought to be too stringent, and I am inclined to think it is, then it seems to me there ought to be no question about saying that no man shall be a member of this Federal corporation and have dealings with himself or with the corporation in which he is interested; in other words, no director of this corporation ought to be permitted to act in any transaction between himself and any corporation in which he is interested. I am going to offer as a substitute for the committee's amendment to insert the following:

No director or officer of the corporation shall, directly or indirectly, participate in any transaction in which he is either directly or indirectly interested.

I am not certain in drawing that phrase as I stand on my feet that I have used the happiest language, but I think the thought is expressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. In lieu of the words proposed to be stricken out by the committee it is proposed to substitute the following:

No director or officer of the corporation shall, directly or indirectly, participate in any transaction in which he is either directly or indirectly interested.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator I have not a particle of objection to that amendment.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It is all right.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand the Senator has offered that as a substitute for the language proposed to be stricken out by the committee, beginning on line 25, page 4?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I accept it.

Mr. REED. I hope the conference will have a little more time to find a happier expression than I have employed.

Mr. SMOOT. We all agree upon the principle announced in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HOLLIS. I understand the committee has accepted the amendment of the Senator from Missouri in lieu of its own amendment. If we could vote on adopting the amendment of the Senator from Missouri as a substitute for the committee amendment, and then vote on whether we want the committee amendment, I would be entirely agreeable, because the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri is a great improvement, but this provision should go at least as far as the provision contained in the bill as originally drawn. There is no particular danger of a man who is a director in a corporation, even in a bank, holding a membership on this board. That is not the trouble. The vice comes in having a member of a banking firm on the board of directors of this war bank, and I will state the reason. The director in an ordinary corporation usually has no individual liability whatever; the stockholder in an ordinary corporation or bank has no individual liability; but the member of a banking firm is liable for every cent of the firm's debts, because he is a partner. That may not be known to Members of the Senate. All the powerful banking concerns in this country are partnerships. There is good reason for that. They have to deal with themselves on the stock exchange. They have to deal with the stock exchange, and the stock exchange will not allow them to be members of the stock exchange unless they are partnerships, so that every partner is individually liable for every dollar's worth of debt. The danger is that some man who is a director in some great corporation will get on this board. The danger is that some man who is a member of a stock-exchange partnership known as a banking house will get on the board.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. If it is rejected we then have restored the original language in the bill, which forbids any man who is a director of another corporation or bank or member of a banking firm from being a member of the board of directors of this war bank.

I have directed the attention of the Senate to the real danger in the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri, which is well intended and which is much better than nothing, but it does not reach the real danger, and I call the attention of the Senate to it.

Mr. REED. The Senator makes the point that my amendment offered in this form shuts out the right to vote directly on the main proposition.

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes.

Mr. REED. I have no desire to do that. I would rather withdraw my amendment than be put in the position of jockeying anybody out of a vote.

Mr. HOLLIS. Oh, no; the Senator—

Mr. REED. I do not mean that unpleasantly. I mean to say that I do not want to do anything that will deny the fullest right to a vote.

Mr. HOLLIS. If the Senator will allow me, I suggest that we be allowed to vote on the Senate committee amendment to strike out certain language, and if the committee amendment is adopted then it will be open to the Senator to offer his amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit me, it is immaterial whether the committee amendment is agreed to or disagreed to, the Senator from Missouri can offer his amendment in either case afterwards. He loses no right.

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator is right, of course.

Mr. REED. I withdraw my amendment for that reason.

Mr. HOLLIS. Then that leaves us to vote squarely on the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment to strike out certain words.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the words be read.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out, on page 4, beginning at line 25, the words:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation or member of any firm of bankers.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that if the Senate shall adopt the committee amendment I will then accept the substitute offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll on agreeing to the amendment of the committee to strike out the words which have been read.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement that I made on the previous vote of my pair and its transfer I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Has the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that my colleague is absent on business of the Senate and that if present he would vote with the committee. That may be a guide to the Senator in his vote.

Mr. WARREN. Then I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with whom I have a pair is necessarily absent. I am informed, however, that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is detained on official business.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Making the same announcement of my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS. Making the same transfer of my pair that I made on the previous vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 37, as follows:

#### YEAS—31.

Bankhead	Hale	Myers	Swanson
Colt	Harding	Pomerene	Underwood
Dillingham	Knox	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fernald	Lodge	Saulsbury	Warren
Fletcher	McCumber	Sheppard	Weeks
France	McKellar	Shields	Williams
Gallinger	McLean	Simmons	Wolcott
Gerry	Martin	Stone	

#### NAYS—37.

Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Page	Sutherland
Borah	Kellogg	Pittman	Thomas
Calder	Kendrick	Poinexter	Thompson
Curtis	Kirby	Reed	Townsend
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Shafrath	Trammell
Gronna	Nelson	Sherman	Vardaman
Hardwick	New	Smith, Mich.	Watson
Henderson	Norris	Smith, S. C.	
Hollis	Nugent	Smoot	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Sterling	

#### NOT VOTING—26.

Ashurst	Goff	King	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Gore	La Follette	Smith, Ga.
Broussard	Hitchcock	Lewis	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	James	Overman	Tillman
Culberson	Johnson, Cal.	Penrose	Walsh
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	
Fall	Kenyon	Ransdell	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I move to insert the word "active" before the word "officer," in line 1, page 5, and to strike out line 2 after the word "corporation" and insert a period, so that it will read:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an active officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish to say on behalf of the committee that I am willing to accept that amendment, and then I shall be glad to accept the substitute which I understand will be offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri whether he now intends to offer his amendment? If not, I will offer it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NORRIS. Has there been an order of the Senate that committee amendments shall first be considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so informed.

Mr. PITTMAN. Unless the Senator from Missouri desires to offer an amendment to the committee amendment along the lines he has just proposed, I will do so.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the committee amendment to strike out this language was rejected, and now it is perfectly proper, of course, for any Senator to offer any amendment to this language. If, however, we have agreed to consider committee amendments first, we ought to dispose of them.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, with the language of the bill as it now is, I do not desire at this moment to present the amendment which I previously suggested. I suggested it then believing that the language that has been retained in the bill was to go out. I am, however, not satisfied with the language as it is, but such an amendment as I may want to propose I have not yet perfected. I am therefore quite willing that the Senator from Nevada should offer any amendment that he has in mind.

Mr. PITTMAN. Under the statement of the Senator from Missouri, I move to strike out, on line 25, page 4, commencing with the word "No" and including that word, down to and including the word "before," on the second line of page 5, and to insert—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not suppose there is any use of making suggestions as to the parliamentary order, but for the sake of putting it into the Record, I will say that under parliamentary law, as I have always understood it, where there is a motion to strike out or to strike out and insert, the language proposed to be stricken out is open to perfecting amendments before the motion to strike out is put. After the motion to strike out has been put and defeated, the language is not open to amendment at that stage, because the Senate has agreed on that precise form of words and has kept them in the bill. We have already amended it and I do not know that it makes any difference if we amend it again, but it is the most loose parliamentary proceeding that I ever saw.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this matter was discussed before it came up, and a number of Senators desired to have an opportunity of voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I should not have voted as I did vote except with the understanding, which was very plain to this body, that various amendments were going to be added at this time.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the Senator's amendment. On the contrary, I think I am for it, if I understand it correctly, as I was for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri; but I merely suggest that this is not the stage when it should be offered. It has got to be offered in the Senate if it is properly offered.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Massachusetts; but as what I have stated was the understanding beforehand, my vote was governed accordingly. I now desire, under that understanding, to offer the amendment. If there is any objection, of course, I will have to wait.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, by unanimous consent we can do anything.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the amendment is not in order at this time, because we are operating under the rule that committee amendments shall first be considered and disposed of; but I think that, in view of the situation, unanimous consent should be given for the consideration of this substitute at this time. I knew that several Senators voted against the Senate committee amendment because they expected that this substitute would be adopted. I have said that if the amendment was rejected I should, if the Senator from Missouri did not see fit to do so, myself offer a substitute. I therefore think, under the circumstances, that unanimous consent ought to be given for the consideration of this amendment at this time.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask unanimous consent for that action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the consideration of his amendment. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let the amendment be read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the words:

No director or officer of the corporation shall continue to be an active officer, director, or trustee of any other corporation.

And to insert:

No director or officer of the corporation shall in any manner participate in the determination of any question affecting his personal interest or the interest of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, just a word in regard to the amendment. I was thoroughly in accord with the purpose of the original provisions of the bill. The purpose was undoubtedly to guard against any of the directors of this institution taking part in the decision of a matter in which he was personally interested. I think, however, that the language is entirely too broad. I believe that it would be a fatal mistake to bar any man from serving the Government in this capacity simply because of the fact that he was a director in some banking institution. I believe that the very highest ability is called for in this undertaking. Indeed, I think the only danger of it lies in the fact that it may be put in incompetent hands. I believe there is far more danger from the mismanagement or the inefficiency of the management of the corporation than there is from corruption. I do not, however, see why we should not follow the regular law governing all corporations in this respect. No director of any corporation is permitted in equity to participate in any action of the board of directors in matters affecting himself. I have hurriedly drawn this language for the purpose of entirely eliminating the possibility of any director of this corporation participating in any manner, either in discussion or in voting, in the decision of any question in which he has a personal interest or any matter affecting the interest of any corporation or association or partnership in which he is directly or indirectly interested. I feel that that is as far as we may safely go in this matter, and that is the reason why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have had, since the Senator from Nevada has been speaking, an opportunity to give the language contained in this bill, and which we refused to strike out, a little further examination. As I now construe it, it seems to me that it simply means that before any man can be appointed to serve upon this board he must have absolutely ceased to be an officer or trustee of any corporation whatsoever. Now, that is going a good way. I am not sure but that it is broad enough to cover a directorship in a church corporation. I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada, which is an improvement in phraseology on the amendment I offered, ought to be adopted, and I think it ought to be followed by amending the succeeding language, which requires a certification under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury by the appointee that he has complied with this requirement. I think that language ought to be changed so that there shall be a certification under oath that the person appointed will comply with the requirement which would be provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Now, Mr. President, if it is not out of order under the rule, I should like to suggest this amendment to the language which follows the next amendment. The language is:

Before entering upon his duties each director and officer shall certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he has complied with this requirement, and shall also—

And so forth.

Mr. President, I am aware that there is an amendment of the committee pending prior to the one that I am discussing, but I ask the chairman of the committee to transpose the proposed amendment of the committee to the end of the section, so that the language which will follow will apply to the amendment which has just been adopted.

Mr. SIMMONS. As I understand, the Senator proposes to retain the words that are stricken out in the committee amendment, namely:

Certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he has complied with this requirement—

And change it to "certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he will comply"—

Mr. REED. "That he will comply with this requirement."

Mr. SIMMONS. With the requirement of the substitute offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] and agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. Would it not be better to ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to?

Mr. REED. It is not necessary to do that.

Mr. SMOOT. The committee amendment, as I understand, has been agreed to; it was agreed to last evening.

Mr. SIMMONS. The amendment to strike out was agreed to yesterday afternoon. That action will have to be reconsidered, and I have no objection to that being done, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. I can offer it as a new amendment with this new language in it.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Missouri, please—

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one moment. If the language of the committee's amendment which has been stricken out had remained in the bill, then the language I have just read requiring the certificate would have been proper. Now, the committee amendment has not been adopted, but there has been adopted for it a substitute which provides in substance that no director of this corporation shall have any personal interest in any transaction of the board. In that condition I think it will be very proper to require some sort of certificate to the effect that the appointee has no such interest. That is what I understand the Senator desires, and only that. The best way to do that, I should think, would be for the Senator to move to reconsider the vote whereby the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Let the Senator ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to reconsider the vote by which the amendment in lines 5, 6, and 7 was adopted.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I am very sure that the committee amendment has not been adopted. I asked last night that all the amendments to this section go over, and I am sure they all went over.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, I will ask the Chair if the committee amendment has been adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the committee amendment has not been adopted.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then the amendment of the Senator from Missouri is in order, and I accept the amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator accepts it, I should like the Senator from Missouri to restate it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I will state to the chairman of the committee what I want to accomplish. The amendment as it now stands reads as follows:

No director or officer of the corporation shall in any manner participate in the determination of any question affecting his personal interest or the interest of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

I now desire to have the section read following the amendment:

Before entering upon his duties each director and officer shall certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he will comply with the restriction aforesaid.

Mr. SMOOT. "Will comply with the restriction aforesaid"?

Mr. REED. I will make it "the provision aforesaid."

Then it would read on:

And he shall also take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office.

Mr. SIMMONS. The effect of that would simply be to transpose the portion of the section which reads "before entering upon his duties each director shall," and so forth, and put it at the bottom of the paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the committee amendment on lines 3 and 4 has been agreed to? Let us try to proceed in order; that is all.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have already made that inquiry, and found that it has not been agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Does not the Senator think we would proceed more in order if we should adopt that amendment and then adopt the amendment of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REED. It would just take that much more time. That question has been raised.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator's amendment comes subsequent to the committee amendment.

Mr. REED. But I ask to transpose it to the foot of the section.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is going to transpose it?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. I understand.

Mr. SIMMONS. I accept the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In the first place, before the word "entering," in line 4, it is proposed to insert the word "Before," beginning a new sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In the committee amendment on lines 6 and 7 it is proposed to strike out the words "has complied with this

requirement, and he shall also" and insert "will comply with the provision aforesaid, and he shall also."

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, what has been done with the remainder of the committee amendments to section 5? There has been a consultation going on on the other side, but I was unable to follow it. Only part of the committee amendment is disposed of by this last suggestion. Are we now perfecting the committee amendment?

Mr. LODGE. That is what is being done, as a matter of fact.

The SECRETARY. So that as amended the paragraph will read:

Before entering upon his duties, each director and officer shall certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he will comply with the provision aforesaid, and he shall also take an oath faithfully to discharge the duties of his office.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I am very sure the Senate does not want to adopt language of that kind, requiring that an officer shall certify that he will do something in the future. "Certify" means to swear to the truth of something that has already been decided, and a man can not certify that he will do something; all he can do is to take a solemn oath that he will do that. I think the language proposed is absolutely incorrect, although I may be mistaken.

Mr. REED. I think it is just as correct to certify that you will do a certain thing as to certify that you have done a certain thing. It is a mere matter of phraseology, but if the Senator prefers to substitute "make an affidavit," I have no objection to that being done.

Mr. HOLLIS. A man can not make affidavit that he will do something; all he can do is to swear that he will.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am perfectly willing to accept the term "certify," but if the appointee is to be required to make an oath to it I am not willing to accept it, and I do not think the Senate ought to ask any such thing of an appointee of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask for a division.

The question being put, on a division the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I should like to know what became of the amendment in lines 3 and 4?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been dealt with.

Mr. LODGE. That is a perfectly natural inquiry. We are now, I understand, to agree to it and put it in another place. It is a wholly needless amendment in any event.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think that the amendment ought to be adopted, but I do not know what the connection is now.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment in lines 3 and 4 has not yet been adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is correct.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that that amendment be transposed and be placed in line 8 after the word "office," at the end of the sentence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert on page 5, line 8, after the word "office," the following:

Any director shall be subject to removal by the President of the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am not going to oppose the amendment, but I do not think there is any necessity whatever for it, because the President of the United States has that power now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. This amendment was put in the bill, I think, by the Finance Committee, because the new institution is to be a corporation, and, while we were disposed to believe that the appointees who will hold office under the corporation will occupy just the same position as any other officer of the Government, we desired to have no possible question about it, and as we were creating a separate entity, a corporation, we put in that provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next amendment passed over is on page 9, where the committee proposes to strike out—

(d) In exceptional cases, to make advances directly to any person, firm, corporation, or association whose operations shall be necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, for periods not exceed-

ing five years from the respective dates of such advances, upon such terms, and upon the security of such bonds, notes, or other obligations, and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the board of directors of the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The corporation shall retain power to require additional collateral security at any time.

And insert:

(d) To make advances directly (1) to any corporation owning or controlling (directly or through stock ownership) any railroad or other public utility, and (2) to any firm, corporation, or association conducting an established and going business whose operations are necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war: *Provided*, That such advances shall be made only in such cases as the board of directors in their discretion shall determine to be of exceptional importance in the public interest. Such advances may be made for periods not exceeding five years from the passage of this act, upon such terms and upon such security and subject to such rules and regulations as may be prescribed from time to time by the board of directors of the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The corporation shall have and retain power to require additional security from time to time.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, on page 9, line 16, after the word "advances," I move to amend the amendment reported by the committee by inserting the words "upon adequate security." That matter was brought up the other day in the Senate by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], and I think it was agreed that it would be wise to put in some provision relating to the securities. Therefore I have offered the amendment for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I did not catch the lines where the amendment is to be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 16, in the portion proposed to be inserted, after the word "advances," it is proposed to insert the words "upon adequate security," so as to read:

(d) To make advances, upon adequate security, directly—

And so forth.

Mr. TOWNSEND. To what does "such" refer? You have not mentioned and security before.

Mr. SMOOT. It refers to "advances"—"such advances."

Mr. TOWNSEND. You say, on page 10, line 3, "such security." Now, what security? Where have you mentioned security before?

Mr. SMOOT. I will call the Senator's attention to line 24, page 9, at the beginning of the sentence:

Such advances—

That is, the advances to be made to these corporations—

may be made for periods not exceeding five years from the passage of this act, upon such terms and upon such security—

It seems to me that if the Senator wants to use the word "adequate," it would be better to have it read "upon such adequate security" rather than to have it read "make advances upon adequate security."

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the word "such," in line 2, is qualified by "as," in line 3—

Such \* \* \* as may be prescribed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. There can be no misunderstanding as to what is meant if the words are inserted where I have them in the bill. It seems to me that it makes it very clear, right on the start, that we are proposing that this board shall demand adequate security for the loan.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Michigan that it would be better English in the latter place, although the meaning would be the same.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the first suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, I think, was that it be put just in front of the word "security" on line 3, page 10. That was his own first suggestion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] made that suggestion.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; it was my suggestion that it go in where I have offered it, on line 16, page 9. If, however, it accomplishes the same result, I do not care; but it seems to me that to put it in at the very beginning makes it entirely clear, and I see nothing the matter with the English as suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. OWEN. The difference in the English is that when in the one case you insert the words "to make advances upon adequate security," and when afterwards you say "upon such security as may be prescribed," there is an apparent conflict of meaning of the terms; while if you introduce the word "adequate" in line 2—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I certainly should want to repeat the word over on page 3.

Mr. OWEN. If you repeat it, then it would not be necessary in the first place—if you make it read "upon such adequate security" on line 3.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the place to put it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. That language seems to apply to the entire advances. I do not know how I got the idea that it was the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, but I gathered it from what he said a day or two ago, and marked "adequate" in front of "security" on line 3, and thought it fully met the subject, and met it very handsomely.

Mr. SMOOT. The senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] gave notice last evening that he intended to propose two amendments to this paragraph, and stated what they were. One of them was to insert "adequate" before the word "security" on page 10, line 3.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; but several days ago the Senator from Michigan first called attention to the importance of using the word "adequate" in connection with the security; and while he was on his feet I wrote "adequate" in front of "security" at that place, and thought it came from him.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did make the suggestion; but my suggestion when I first proposed it was that it be put in here, and I am still convinced that the proper place for those words is after the word "advances" on line 16, page 9, as I offered it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I shall not resist the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. I do not think it necessary; I think we can safely trust the board to take adequate security; but it can do no harm.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] was called out of the Chamber, and he asked me to offer for him an amendment on page 10, at the beginning of line 3, to insert the word "adequate." I think the amendment just adopted makes that unnecessary, but I should like to have the views of the Senator from Georgia on that point.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like to have it inserted in front, and there, too, because here we are dealing with their power to regulate and require security.

Mr. HOLLIS. There seems to be no objection; and I therefore move that the word "adequate" be inserted at the beginning of line 3, on page 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 10, line 3, before the word "security," it is proposed to insert the word "adequate."

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, another amendment to the committee amendment that the Senator from Colorado asked me to submit was this: On page 9, line 20, after the word "whose," insert "bonded indebtedness is not in excess of its actually invested capital, and whose," so that the amendment will read, beginning with part (2)—

to any firm, corporation, or association conducting an established and going business whose bonded indebtedness is not in excess of its actually invested capital, and whose operations are necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war.

I am quite sure that the directors of this bank would not do that; but it certainly will do no harm to limit it to corporations that have at least invested as much capital in their business as they have outstanding obligations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 20, after the word "whose" and before the word "operations," it is proposed to insert "bonded indebtedness is not in excess of its actually invested capital, and whose."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, if I understand that amendment, it means that if a street car line or a railroad or any other public-utility corporation has built the line of railroad, or the plant for furnishing gas or electric light, or is carrying on any other business that could be classed as a public utility, if any corporation has issued bonds for the purpose of building the plant or the road and has not issued as much stock and paid the actual cash for the stock into the company, then it could not receive any assistance under this paragraph. In other words, in order for a public-utility corporation to obtain assistance

under paragraph (d) of section 6 of the bill, they must have paid in cash for their stock an amount equal to the bonds that have been issued and sold for the installation of the plant or the building of the road.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I do not understand that to be the effect of this amendment at all. This amendment, like the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan a few moments ago, is along the lines of the suggestion I made during the speech of the Senator from North Carolina in presenting this bill; and at that time I understood that provision would be made so that the corporations that had bond issues that represented more money than had actually gone into the corporation would not be entitled to the benefits of this act. We all know that there are a great many paper corporations, where the stock represents nothing and where the bonds very often do not represent much more than 40 or 50 or 60 or 70 per cent of the actual cash that comes into the treasury and is expended for the benefit of the corporation. But the point raised by the Senator from Utah is an entirely different thing. As I understood the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, as presented by the Senator from New Hampshire, it was that the actual money that is invested in the corporation's business must equal the amount of bonds. Now, it does not say that that must come from the proceeds of the sale of bonds. It may come from the proceeds of the sale of bonds and the sale of stock. If a corporation has outstanding an issue of a million dollars of bonds, before it could get the benefits of this act it would have to establish to the satisfaction of the directors of the corporation that a million dollars of the money had gone into the corporation, either from the sale of those bonds which are outstanding to the extent of a million dollars, or from the proceeds of the sale of those bonds plus such money as may have been paid in on the capital stock.

I will inquire of the Senator from New Hampshire if that is not the purpose of the amendment as he understands it?

Mr. HOLLIS. That is exactly my understanding of what it does mean.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I had not seen the amendment and only heard it read once from the desk; but having secured a copy of the amendment and having read it in connection with the paragraph itself, the statement made just now by the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct, and I see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendment stated.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I had not seen the amendment until this moment. I had in my mind the idea that the amendment was a little differently worded from this. I had in my mind the idea that it used only the word "capital," and I was afraid that that might not include surplus.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to hear that amendment stated again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have in mind a great many industrial corporations whose surplus exceeds their original paid-in capital, and I was anxious that this amendment should include both the surplus and the original capital. I think it does. It reads:

whose bonded indebtedness is not in excess of its actually invested capital—

Mr. McCUMBER. What page and line?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is on page 9, line 20, after the word "whose."

Mr. McCUMBER. Now will the Senator read it again?

Mr. SIMMONS (reading)—

whose bonded indebtedness is not in excess of its actually invested capital, and whose operations—

Mr. SMOOT. It does not say "surplus."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, let me ask the chairman of the committee a question on that point. Suppose that here is a corporation manufacturing munitions of war. It has a million dollars invested in its plant. It has out bonds to the extent of a million dollars against that plant. Therefore it has no assets, so far as the value of its plant is concerned, in excess of the bonds against it. Suppose, however, that it has sold bonds for \$50,000,000, and has the money in its treasury for the purpose of extending that plant to meet the demands of the Government. Now, it has its \$50,000,000 and yet the Government could not give it any assistance unless it gave additional security. If the Government required \$100,000,000, it could not take any other kind of security, though the corporation had additional security.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, there is another matter that I am wondering if I am right about. I mention it in order that I may be set right if I am wrong.

Suppose we have a corporation that has been in business a long time. Its original investment in capital was small, but that business has grown to great magnitude. Possibly it is not all due to additional capital. Possibly it is worth more in the market to-day, and would be worth more as security in the market, than is represented by its bonded indebtedness and original capital; and yet its bonded indebtedness is due and has to be refunded. As I understand, under the provisions of this amendment that corporation could not be loaned a greater amount than its bonded indebtedness at the present time, plus its capital originally invested. Now, might not occasion arise—I do not know; I am not clear about that—where relief might be desired, and desirable on the part of the Government, by a concern of that kind, which this amendment might cut off?

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, line 20, after the word "whose," it is proposed to insert the words "bonded indebtedness is not in excess of its actually invested capital, and whose."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it seems to me that that language is a little unfortunate. The actually invested capital might have been a million dollars. It might be all gone, or it might be nine-tenths gone, and yet it was invested. Its actually invested capital might be \$100,000 and its actual property might be a million dollars, because the property may have increased vastly beyond the actual investment. It depends on the meaning you give to the term "invested." I think the Senator's idea is not a bad idea; but I think it would be better carried out if, instead of using the term "actually invested," he would say "its actual assets."

Mr. KNOX. Why not say "actually invested capital and assets"? I was just about to make that suggestion when the Senator rose.

Mr. REED. That would be better.

Mr. KNOX. That seems to obviate the objection made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That would be all right.

Mr. KNOX. If the Senator will accept that, I think that will cover it.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I did not draft this amendment. I had no conversation at all with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] about it. He asked me if I would offer it. I have sent for him, and he can not leave the Military Affairs Committee, where he is presiding to-day. I think myself that "invested capital" means whatever real property has gone into the concern. I do not think there is any doubt about that; but if other Senators think it would make it plainer to say "actually invested capital and assets," I have no objection. I am not sure that the Senator from Colorado would agree to it, but I will take the responsibility of accepting that modification.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think it is very wise to use the word "assets." I am inclined to agree with the Senator from New Hampshire in his statement that assets would be covered by "actually invested capital," because if the corporation has accumulated something since its organization and since its original capital stock was converted into money and put into the corporation, that becomes a part of its actually invested capital; but I think it would be safer to put that in.

Mr. HOLLIS. Then I will modify the amendment by adding, after the word "capital," the words "and assets."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I simply wish to suggest to the chairman that we are extending rather than limiting the credit to be given. When we adopted the amendment adding the word "adequate" it meant security which would absolutely protect the Government. Now you propose to allow the Government to make a loan upon security that has no equity beyond the loan. In other words, after making provision for adequate security, you have now changed the language so that you practically allow the Government to make a loan up to the extent of the value of the property and all assets; and that certainly is not adequate from any financial standpoint.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it is not so much a question of what they put in as it is what it is worth. They might have put in twice as much as it is worth. It is adequate security that we want. It is something that will pay back the obligation. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota that we already have it stronger than the amendment would make it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; very much stronger than the amendment would make it.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has sent word that he would like to be here when this amendment is voted upon, and it is impossible for him to leave now. He has asked, therefore, that this committee amendment may go over until to-morrow. I understand the parliamentary situation to be that the pending amendment is subsection (d), and that if that is acted upon it will not afterwards be amendable. In order to save the rights of the Senator from Colorado, this whole committee amendment—that is, subsection (d)—would have to go over. I ask that for him.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I am willing that it shall go over temporarily, but I should not like to consent that it go over until to-morrow. If it goes over temporarily, I do not think we will reach it again this afternoon; but if we get through everything else and this is all that is left, I would not wish to have the bill go over until to-morrow for that purpose. I will consent that it go over for the present.

Mr. HOLLIS. Does the Senator expect to pass the bill to-night?

Mr. SIMMONS. I hardly think we will; but—

Mr. HOLLIS. I hardly think the bill will be passed to-night. However, I am willing to take a temporary accommodation and run the risk of its possibly coming up later in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 10, line 12, after the word "its," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; in line 14, after the word "such," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; in line 18, after the words "of the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; in line 20, after the word "Such," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; in line 22, after the words "of the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; in line 23, after the words "and the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; in line 24, after the word "Such," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; on page 11, line 5, after the word "Such," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; in line 11, after the word "such," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; in line 18, after the words "by the," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; in line 19, after the words "of the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation"; on page 12, line 9, after the words "by the," to strike out "notes or obligations" and insert "bonds"; and in line 19, after the words "of the," to strike out "corporation" and insert "Corporation," so as to make the clause read:

(f) To issue and have outstanding at any one time its bonds in an amount aggregating not more than eight times its paid-in capital, such bonds to mature not less than one year nor more than five years from the respective dates of issue, and to bear such rate or rates of interest and may be redeemable before maturity at the option of the Corporation as may be determined by the board of directors, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such bonds shall have a first and paramount floating charge on all the assets of the Corporation, and the Corporation shall not at any time mortgage or pledge any of its assets. Such bonds may be issued at par in payment of any advances authorized by this act, or for any of the purposes of this act may be offered for sale publicly or to any individual, firm, association, or corporation at such price or prices as the board of directors may determine, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such bonds may be dealt in by Federal reserve banks in the same manner and to the same extent as bonds or notes of the United States not bearing the circulation privilege, and Federal reserve banks shall be authorized, subject to the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board, to rediscount and purchase paper and make advances secured by such bonds in the same manner and to the same extent and at the same rates or at such higher rates as the Federal Reserve Board may approve, as they may purchase or rediscount paper or make advances secured by such bonds or notes of the United States under authority of the Federal Reserve act. Any Federal reserve bank acquiring by purchase or rediscount such paper secured by the bonds of the Corporation may, with the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, use such paper so acquired for any purpose for which it is authorized to use paper secured by such bonds or notes of the United States: *Provided, however,* That whenever Federal reserve notes are issued against the security of such paper the Federal Reserve Board may make a special interest charge on such notes, which, in the discretion of the Federal Reserve Board, need not be applicable to other Federal reserve notes which may from time to time be issued and outstanding. All provisions of law not inconsistent herewith in respect to the purchase or rediscount by any Federal reserve bank of paper secured by such bonds or notes of the United States and in respect to Federal reserve notes issued against the security of such paper shall extend, in so far as applicable, to the purchase or rediscount of paper secured by the bonds of the Corporation and to the Federal reserve notes issued against the security of such paper.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before we proceed any further I should like to refer back to the amendment on the top of page 5.

I am informed that on account of the way the motion was put a different result appears on the record than was the intention of myself, and I know of the Senate, because we all understood it one way.

The amendment I am referring to is the one in which I proposed a substitute for the language appearing in the bill in these words:

Before entering upon his duties, each director and officer shall certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he will comply with the provisions aforesaid.

I was offering that as a substitute for the language of the bill; but when the Chair put the motion he put it as an amendment to the committee's proposed amendment, and as it appears in the record the committee's amendment was adopted, the committee's amendment being to strike out.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the committee's amendment to strike out the words "certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he has complied with this requirement, and shall also" was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. REED. Now, I ask that my motion be put in the form of a substitute; that is, that in lieu of the language contained in the bill beginning with the word "Before," in line 4, and extending to the word "also," in line 7, the following language shall be employed:

Before entering upon his duties, each director and officer shall certify under oath to the Secretary of the Treasury that he will comply with the provisions aforesaid, and he shall also—

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I shall not call for the yeas and nays on that amendment, but I wish to give notice that when the bill comes before the Senate I am going to ask for a separate vote on that amendment and all the changes we have made in reference to that provision, and also the one commencing with the word "no," on line 25, page 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 13, line 1, after "SEC. 7," to strike out:

That for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, and providing for the public security and defense, through the restriction of unnecessary capital expenditures, the corporation may, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, investigate and license, or refuse to license, the sale, or offering for sale or for subscription, of securities, as hereinafter provided.

And insert:

That for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, and providing for the public security and defense, through the restriction of unnecessary capital expenditures, there shall be appointed by the Federal Reserve Board, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, a capital-issues committee, to consist of five members, of whom at least three shall be members of the Federal Reserve Board, which may, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by such committee, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, investigate and license, or refuse to license, the sale, or offering for sale or for subscription, of securities, as hereinafter provided. Such committee shall, however, grant licenses for any such sale, or any such offering for sale or for subscription, which it shall determine to be consistent with the foregoing purposes. The terms during which the several members of such committee shall respectively hold office shall be determined by the Federal Reserve Board, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the compensation of the several members of such committee who are not members of the Federal Reserve Board shall be \$7,500 per annum, to be paid by the corporation.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I think there ought to be an appeal provided from the judgment of the capital-issues committee. Under the structure of the bill the board of the corporation handles the general business of the corporation, while three members of the Federal Reserve Board—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, would the Senator object to our taking an adjournment now and bringing up this matter in the morning? I understand that it is desired to have an executive session.

Mr. OWEN. No; not at all. I ask that my proposed substitute be printed in the RECORD, and I will bring it up to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that course will be taken.

The substitute is as follows:

Substitute for page 13, down to period on line 4 of page 14:

"That for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war and providing for the public security and defense through the restriction of unnecessary capital expenditures, the corporation may, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, by a committee of five experts, to be known as the 'capital issues committee,' investigate and license or refuse to license the sale or offer for sale or for subscription all securities as hereinafter provided."

"An appeal shall lie from such committee of experts to the Federal Reserve Board in cases where a license may be delayed or refused. All appeals shall be passed on within 30 days, or be held as granted. All decisions and appeals in refusing licenses shall be made in writing and be a public record. The members of the capital issues committee shall receive \$7,500 per annum."

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me while I offer an amendment, not to be voted upon, but to lie upon the table? I should like to have it printed, if I may.

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I offer the following amendment, to lie on the table: On page 8, line 11, after the word "deposits," insert the following: "or any building or loan associations."

Mr. OWEN. Before we go into executive session I wish also to give notice that I shall move to strike out section 11 of the bill to-morrow, on the ground that Congress ought not to abrogate its own authority to determine the validity and constitutionality of this act.

Mr. STERLING. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I send to the desk an amendment to the bill, which I ask may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered.

Mr. GORE. I wish to give notice that I shall move an amendment on page 15, line 7, after the word "any," to insert the words "State or by any."

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 2, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1, 1918.*

##### MEMBER OF THE AIRCRAFT BOARD.

Harry B. Thayer, of New York City, to be a member of the Aircraft Board.

##### JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Edward B. Kimball, of the District of Columbia, to be judge of the municipal court, District of Columbia. (Reappointment.)

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

Claude R. Porter, of Centerville, Iowa, to be United States attorney, southern district of Iowa. (Reappointment.)

William C. Hammer, of Ashboro, N. C., to be United States attorney, western district of North Carolina. (Reappointment.)

Francis H. Weston, of Charleston, S. C., to be United States attorney, eastern district of South Carolina. (Reappointment.)

John E. Green, jr., of Houston, Tex., to be United States attorney, southern district of Texas. (Reappointment.)

William W. Ray, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be United States attorney, district of Utah. (Reappointment.)

Francis A. Garrecht, of Spokane, Wash., to be United States attorney, eastern district of Washington. (Reappointment.)

##### UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Charles T. Walton, of Los Angeles, Cal., to be United States marshal, southern district of California. (Reappointment.)

Nicholas F. Reed, of Ottumwa, Iowa, to be United States marshal, southern district of Iowa. (Reappointment.)

Henry M. Cox, of West Liberty, Ky., to be United States marshal, eastern district of Kentucky, vice Robert C. Ford, whose term has expired.

John Q. Newell, of Oklahoma City, Okla., to be United States marshal, western district of Oklahoma. (Reappointment.)

James S. Magee, of Scranton, Pa., to be United States marshal, middle district of Pennsylvania. (Reappointment.)

James L. Sims, of Charleston, S. C., to be United States marshal, eastern district of South Carolina. (Reappointment.)

Aquila Nebeker, of Salt Lake City, Utah, to be United States marshal, district of Utah. (Reappointment.)

James E. McGovern, of Spokane, Wash., to be United States marshal, eastern district of Washington. (Reappointment.)

John M. Boyle, of Tacoma, Wash., to be United States marshal, western district of Washington. (Reappointment.)

Clarence E. Smith, of Parkersburg, W. Va., to be United States marshal, northern district of West Virginia. (Reappointment.)

#### REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Carl H. Massie, of Sundance, Wyo., to be register of the land office at Sundance, Wyo., vice William J. Wood, term expired.

Frank Langley, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho. (Reappointment.)

#### RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONIES.

Charles R. Yeoman, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Sundance, Wyo. (Reappointment.)

Grant T. Stahl, of Wyoming, to be receiver of public moneys at Buffalo, Wyo. (Reappointment.)

Jacob A. Mayer, of Montana, to be receiver of public moneys at Havre, Mont. (Reappointment.)

Edward J. Hughes, of North Dakota, to be receiver of public moneys at Dickinson, N. Dak. (Reappointment.)

#### SURVEYOR GENERAL.

Lucius Dills, of New Mexico, to be surveyor general of New Mexico. (Reappointment.)

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL ARMY.

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Col. Charles Keller, Corps of Engineers, to be brigadier general with rank from February 26, 1918.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

##### QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Brig. Gen. Harry L. Rogers, Quartermaster Corps, National Army, to be brigadier general, Regular Army, for a period of four years from February 26, 1918, vice Brig. Gen. Thomas Cruse, retired from active service January 8, 1918.

##### INFANTRY ARM.

*To be captain with rank from date of appointment.*

Harry Graham, late captain of Infantry.

##### MEDICAL CORPS.

First Lieut. Guy Blair Denit, Medical Reserve Corps, to be first lieutenant in the Medical Corps, with rank from February 26, 1918.

*To be first lieutenants, with rank from February 25, 1918.*

First Lieut. Joseph Price, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Laurence Arthur Petty, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. William Sharp McCann, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph Richard Turner, jr., Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph Emmerson Strode, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Frederick Franklin Alsop, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. William Philip Smale, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. William Edward Nesbit, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Stewart Lawwill, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Rollo Preston Bourbon, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Wesley Cintra Cox, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Joe Harold St. John, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Robert Archie Sherwood, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Nuckols Thornton Davie, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Harold Vincent Raycroft, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. John Darlington Nourse, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph Duerson Stout, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. William Stanton Martens, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Raymond Osborne Dart, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Alfred Alexander Schwartz, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Frank Hernon Chase, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. John Manning Venable, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Alfred Edward Jones, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Floyd Vern Kilgore, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Adolph George Christian Schnack, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. John Christopher Woodland, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Walter Leslie Perry, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Zera Exley Bolin, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Joseph Wheeler Smith, jr., Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Martin Joachim Seid, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Leo Edward Reimann, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Bernard Lipscomb Jarman, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Roy Terry Haskell, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Edmund Anderson Lodge, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. John Frank Lieberman, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Lucius Lamar Handly, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. John Albert Randall, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Robert Shoemaker, 3d, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Harvey Robinson Livesay, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. John Earl Kiley, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. William Otto Fischer, Medical Reserve Corps.  
 First Lieut. Harry Beauvoir Hansen, Medical Reserve Corps.  
 First Lieut. Arthur Nelson Henson, Medical Reserve Corps.  
 First Lieut. Don Clio Bartholomew, Medical Reserve Corps.  
 First Lieut. Cedric Eugene Filkins, Medical Reserve Corps.  
 First Lieut. Henry Andrew Rasmussen, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Clyde Everett Shedd, Medical Reserve Corps.  
 First Lieut. Benjamin Franklin Frazer, Medical Reserve Corps.

First Lieut. Cornelius Stephen Conklin, Medical Reserve Corps.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

##### *To be colonels.*

Lieut. Col. Robert S. Smith, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from February 14, 1918.

Lieut. Col. Richmond McA. Schofield, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from February 23, 1918.

##### *To be lieutenant colonels.*

Maj. Morton J. Henry, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from February 14, 1918.

Maj. William Elliott, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from February 23, 1918.

##### VETERINARY CORPS.

Asst. Veterinarian Jules H. Uri, Veterinary Corps, to be veterinarian with rank from October 9, 1916.

#### PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY PROMOTION, IN THE ARMY.

##### INFANTRY ARM.

##### *To be captain with rank from December 29, 1917.*

First Lieut. Sigurd J. Simonsen.

##### *To be captains with rank from December 31, 1917.*

First Lieut. Thomas G. Bond.

First Lieut. John E. Haywood.

##### *To be captain with rank from January 9, 1918.*

First Lieut. Willis H. Hale.

##### *To be captain with rank from January 10, 1918.*

First Lieut. Noe C. Killian.

##### *To be captains with rank from January 16, 1918.*

First Lieut. Lindsay P. Johns.

First Lieut. Walter R. Mann.

##### *To be captain with rank from January 18, 1918.*

First Lieut. Henry W. Lee.

##### *To be captain with rank from January 21, 1918.*

First Lieut. Charles A. Shamotulski.

##### PORTO RICO REGIMENT OF INFANTRY.

##### *To be first lieutenant with rank from January 17, 1917.*

Second Lieut. Modesto E. Rodriguez.

#### TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

##### *To be colonel with rank from February 5, 1918.*

Lieut. Col. Robert H. C. Kelton, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be colonels with rank from February 6, 1918.*

Lieut. Col. Percy P. Bishop, Coast Artillery Corps (General Staff Corps).

Lieut. Col. Henry J. Hatch, Coast Artillery Corps.

Lieut. Col. William F. Hase, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be colonel with rank from February 8, 1918.*

Lieut. Col. William R. Doores, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonel with rank from January 26, 1918.*

Maj. Hugh K. Taylor, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonels with rank from January 28, 1918.*

Maj. Alden Trotter, Coast Artillery Corps (Ammunition Train).

Maj. Frank S. Long, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 5, 1918.*

Maj. John P. Spurr, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 6, 1918.*

Maj. Francis W. Ralston, Coast Artillery Corps (Adjutant General's Department).

Maj. Adna G. Clarke, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Samuel G. Shartle, Coast Artillery Corps (Inspector General's Department).

Maj. Michael H. Barry, Coast Artillery Corps (Ammunition Train).

Maj. Clarence G. Bunker, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 8, 1918.*

Maj. William H. Tobin, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Maj. Harry J. Watson, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 9, 1918.*

Maj. Jacob E. Wyke, Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Charles O. Zollars, Coast Artillery Corps (Quartermaster Corps).

Maj. John Storek, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonels with rank from February 10, 1918.*

Maj. Jacob M. Coward, Coast Artillery Corps (General Staff Corps).

Maj. John L. Roberts, jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

Maj. Frederick L. Buck, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### *To be lieutenant colonel with rank from February 15, 1918.*

Maj. Jay P. Hopkins, Coast Artillery Corps.

##### INFANTRY ARM.

##### *To be major with rank from August 5, 1917.*

Capt. Sydney Smith, additional officer.

#### PROVISIONAL APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE ARMY.

##### FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

*To be second lieutenant of Field Artillery with rank from February 22, 1918.*

Second Lieut. Irvin H. Zeff, Coast Artillery Corps.

#### TRANSFER TO THE ACTIVE LIST OF THE ARMY.

##### INFANTRY ARM.

##### *To be captain with rank from October 3, 1915.*

First Lieut. Sydney Smith, retired.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1918:

Eddie J. Estess,  
 James D. Moore,  
 William W. Wilson,  
 William H. Stiles, jr.,  
 Victor D. Herbster,  
 David F. Ducey,  
 Donald T. Hunter,  
 Cary W. Magruder,  
 Edmund W. Strother,  
 William H. Pashley,  
 Fred T. Berry,  
 William R. Purnell,  
 Edwin Guthrie,  
 James D. Smith,  
 Frederic T. Van Auken,  
 Marshall Collins,  
 Kinchen L. Hill,  
 Thomas C. Kinkaid,  
 Lee P. Warren,  
 Ernest F. Buck,  
 Allan G. Olson,  
 Charles M. James,  
 Ralph G. Walling,  
 Selah M. La Bounty,  
 Henry E. Parsons,  
 Harry G. Donald,  
 Abner M. Steckel,  
 John L. Schaffer,  
 Leland Jordan, jr.,  
 Edward G. Blakeslee,  
 John H. Everson,  
 Worrall R. Carter,  
 James G. Stevens,  
 Robert R. M. Emmet,  
 John C. Jennings,  
 Henry B. Le Bourgeois,  
 Paul J. Peyton,  
 Laurance S. Stewart,  
 Guy C. Barnes,  
 William A. Hodgman,  
 Cleveland McCauley,  
 Martin J. Peterson,  
 Robert E. Rogers,  
 Samuel S. Payne,  
 Leslie C. Davis,  
 Harry H. Forgas,  
 Franklin P. Conger,  
 Raymond G. Thomas,

Aquilla G. Dibrell,  
 Henry D. McGuire,  
 Edward H. Connor,  
 William B. Cothran,  
 Theodore S. Wilkinson, jr.,  
 William W. Smith,  
 David I. Hedrick,  
 Olaf M. Hustvedt,  
 Harold T. Smith,  
 Cummings L. Lothrop, jr.,  
 Preston B. Haines,  
 Gerard Bradford,  
 Mark L. Hersey, jr.,  
 Frank T. Leighton,  
 Alva D. Bernhard,  
 Chester S. Roberts,  
 Penn L. Carroll,  
 Benjamin V. McCandlish,  
 Daniel A. McElduff,  
 Arthur S. Dysart,  
 Hugh P. Le Clair,  
 Edmund S. R. Brandt,  
 Harold S. Burdick,  
 James D. Maloney,  
 Alan G. Kirk,  
 Fitzhugh Green,  
 Levi B. Bye,  
 Granville B. Hoey,  
 Tracy L. McCauley,  
 Francis W. Scanland,  
 Joel W. Bunkley,  
 Max B. De Mott,  
 Ernest J. Blankenship,  
 John J. Saxer,  
 Leo L. Lindley,  
 Harold C. Train,  
 Wallace L. Lind,  
 Richard McC. Elliot, jr.,  
 Lee P. Johnson,  
 Monroe Kelly,  
 Marion C. Robertson,  
 Edward C. Raguette,  
 Ward W. Waddell,  
 Charles C. Davis,  
 Robert R. Paunack,  
 Frank D. Manock,  
 George K. Stoddard,  
 Williams C. Wickham,  
 Freeland A. Daubin, and  
 Hugh V. McCabe.

Lieut. Claude S. Gillette to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of February, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1918:

James A. Scott,  
 Julius W. Simms,  
 William E. Miller,  
 George F. Chaptine,  
 Douglas C. Woodward,  
 William J. Forrestel,  
 Armistead C. Rogers,  
 John S. Roberts,  
 John D. Price,  
 Norman O. Wynkoop,  
 James B. Ryan,  
 William W. Schott,  
 Sidney W. Kirtland,  
 Joseph H. Lawson,  
 Stanwix G. Mayfield, jr.,  
 Richard E. Webb,  
 Edwin F. Cochrane,  
 Charles T. Gilliam,  
 Gilbert C. Hoover,  
 Thomas V. Cooper,  
 Walter S. Carrington,  
 Newbold T. Lawrence, jr.,  
 Roy K. Jones,  
 Martin B. Stonestreet,  
 Heman J. Redfield,  
 Richard H. Jones,  
 Lowell Cooper,  
 Linton Herndon,  
 Andrew C. McFall,

Leon F. Brown,  
 Herbert S. Jones,  
 Herbert J. Grassie,  
 Robert N. Kennedy,  
 Isaiah Parker,  
 Carl H. Hilton,  
 Chaplin E. Evans,  
 James K. Davis,  
 George D. Price,  
 Cassin Young,  
 Carlyle Craig,  
 Knefler McGinnis,  
 James P. Compton,  
 George G. Robertson,  
 Fred W. Connor,  
 Dallas Wait,  
 Frederick E. Haeberle,  
 John E. Ostrander, jr.,  
 Edmund E. Brady, jr.,  
 Houston L. Maples,  
 George W. McIver, jr.,  
 Henry R. Oster,  
 Randall E. Dees,  
 Colin Campbell,  
 Paul W. F. Huschke,  
 Theodore L. Schumacher,  
 Clarence W. Johnson,  
 Douglas W. Coe,  
 Frank G. Fahrion,  
 Albert Noble,  
 Norborne L. Rawlings,  
 Ingolf N. Kiland,  
 Frank H. Dean,  
 Edward A. Mitchell,  
 Harold S. Klein,  
 Alexander D. Douglas,  
 Lawrence Wainwright,  
 Homer N. Wallin,  
 Donald B. Duncan,  
 Sydney J. Wynne,  
 Earle E. Muschitz,  
 Robert B. Dashiell,  
 Julian L. Woodruff,  
 John O'D. Richmond,  
 David C. Fox,  
 Andrew G. Shepard,  
 Simon P. Fullinwider,  
 Lisle F. Small,  
 William P. O. Clarke,  
 Edmund B. Caldwell,  
 Jay K. Allen,  
 Nicholas Vytlačil,  
 Stanton H. Wooster,  
 Edward B. Rogers,  
 George T. Howard,  
 Charles L. Hayden,  
 Robert L. Randolph, jr.,  
 Robert G. Tobin,  
 Theodore M. Waldschmidt,  
 Herbert B. Knowles,  
 Adolph P. Schneider,  
 Anson A. Bigelow,  
 Robert R. Ogg,  
 John C. Tyler,  
 Harold B. Sallada,  
 Benjamin Buchalter,  
 George R. Fairlamb, jr.,  
 Joseph W. Gregory,  
 John R. Cruse,  
 John T. Metcalf,  
 Ross F. Collins,  
 Benjamin F. Staud,  
 Paul F. Shortridge,  
 Francis C. Denebrink,  
 John J. Twomey,  
 Felix B. Stump,  
 Robert B. Matthews,  
 Hugh St. C. Searse,  
 Walter C. Calhoun,  
 Carl F. Holden,  
 Lester J. Hudson,  
 Kingsland Dunwoody,  
 Samuel B. Brewer,  
 Vincent J. Moore,  
 Frank W. Lively,

James H. Conyne,  
 Davenport Browne,  
 Frederic W. Neilson,  
 Franklin S. Irby,  
 Allen I. Price,  
 Colin DeV. Headlee,  
 Byron K. Presnell,  
 Merrill Comstock,  
 Robert W. McReynolds, jr.,  
 Richard W. Gruelick,  
 Harrison Avery,  
 Paul U. Tevis,  
 Leonard Doughty, jr.,  
 Wilbur V. Shown,  
 Hanson E. Ely, jr.,  
 George K. Weber,  
 Ralph U. Hyde,  
 William F. Dietrich,  
 Ralph Wyman,  
 Andrew G. Reaves,  
 George C. Cummings,  
 Richard H. Harper,  
 George M. Keller,  
 John B. Heffernan,  
 Edward J. Moran,  
 Harry C. Blodgett,  
 John H. Keefe,  
 Elliott M. Senn,  
 Francis W. Benson,  
 Thomas R. Cooley, jr.,  
 Vernon F. Grant,  
 George L. Harriss,  
 Francis T. Spellman,  
 Homer W. Clark,  
 Carl L. Hensen,  
 Edward Sparrow,  
 Ben H. Wyatt,  
 Robert L. Porter, jr.,  
 Ward P. Davis,  
 Guido F. Forster,  
 Volney O. Clark,  
 Edward H. Jones,  
 Galle A. Poindexter,  
 Earl W. Morris,  
 Robert W. Fleming,  
 Thomas B. Hendley,  
 William J. Morcock,  
 Kenneth L. Coontz,  
 Karl Keller,  
 Howard F. Councill,  
 Robert E. Keating,  
 Philip W. Warren,  
 John N. Walton,  
 Earl S. Hurlbut,  
 Allan R. McCann,  
 Evan G. Hanson,  
 Herbert W. Anderson,  
 William G. Ludlow, jr.,  
 Carl W. Brewington,  
 Leonard B. Austin,  
 Chester McK. Holton,  
 John H. Jenkins,  
 Leonard P. Wessell,  
 Emile Topp,  
 Frank L. Worden,  
 Donald R. Evans,  
 Frank J. Hanafee,  
 Andrew R. Mack,  
 John G. M. Stone,  
 Ralph F. Skylstead,  
 Clarence O. Ward,  
 Guy W. Clark,  
 Thomas D. Ross,  
 James P. Conover, jr.,  
 John V. Murphy,  
 Francis A. Smith,  
 Peyton H. Park,  
 Conrad L. Jacobsen,  
 Kenneth Floyd-Jones,  
 William McK. Reifel,  
 William H. Ball,  
 Laurence P. Sargent,  
 Seabury Cook,  
 Constantine N. Perkins,  
 Rollin V. A. Falling,

Benjamin O. Wells,  
 Laurence E. Kelly,  
 Herbert V. Wiley,  
 Douglas A. Spencer,  
 John J. Bartholdi,  
 Charles W. Weitzel,  
 Harold F. Ely,  
 Isidore Lehrfeld,  
 Stephen E. Dillon,  
 John H. Forshew, jr.,  
 William S. B. Claude,  
 William S. Heath,  
 Guy B. Hoover,  
 Kenneth M. Hoeffel,  
 Joseph W. Paige,  
 Forrest P. Sherman,  
 William R. Nichols,  
 Ernest B. Colton,  
 Joseph W. Fowler,  
 William H. Hopkins, jr.,  
 William J. Malone,  
 Oscar H. Holtmann,  
 Lawrence B. Richardson,  
 James Fife, jr.,  
 Moses B. Byington, jr.,  
 Frank R. Dodge,  
 George T. Cuddihy,  
 William W. Warlick,  
 Vincent R. Murphy,  
 Ralph S. McDowell,  
 Henry A. Hutchins, jr.,  
 Charles W. Styer,  
 Thomas L. Sprague,  
 Owen E. Grima,  
 Einar R. Johnson,  
 Martin J. Connolly,  
 Pal L. Meadows,  
 John D. Crecca,  
 Frederick L. Douthit,  
 Frederick S. Holmes,  
 Thomas B. Inglis,  
 Earl E. Stone,  
 James D. Jacobs,  
 John J. Ballentine,  
 Edwin H. Price,  
 Everett B. Browne,  
 John R. Sullivan,  
 James V. B. Lawyer,  
 John D. Alvis,  
 John N. Whelan,  
 Daniel W. Tomlinson, 4th,  
 Edward F. McCartin, and  
 Hayden H. Smith.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Donald A. Green to be a Lieutenant in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of February, 1918.

The following-named ensigns to be Lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1918:

Emory F. Hosmer,  
 Ernest Heilmann,  
 Otto J. W. Haltnorth,  
 Percy H. Bierce,  
 Franklin E. Chester,  
 Frank G. Mehling,  
 James J. O'Brien,  
 Edward Crouch,  
 William DeFries,  
 John H. Hupp,  
 Daniel Dowling,  
 Edward C. Wurster,  
 Arthur B. Dorsey,  
 Arthur D. Freshman,  
 Gustav C. Tanske,  
 Leroy Rodd,  
 Charles W. A. Campbell,  
 Edward Wenk,  
 Frank C. Wisker,  
 Louis M. Wegat,  
 Harry E. Stevens,  
 David P. Henderson,  
 Harry A. Pinkerton,  
 Herman Kossler,  
 Oscar E. Anderson,  
 Henry McEvoy,

Lawrence Wittmann,  
 Alvin E. Skinner,  
 Joseph Chamberlin,  
 Newton R. George,  
 Ralph G. Moody,  
 John McN. D. Knowles,  
 Robert G. Greenleaf,  
 Charles F. Beecher,  
 Frank R. King,  
 William H. Hubbard,  
 James MacIntyre,  
 Ernest W. Dobie,  
 Stephen H. Badgett,  
 Jonathan H. Warman,  
 Walter M. Shipley,  
 John C. Parker,  
 Charles O. Hathaway,  
 James M. Berlin,  
 Walter Lau,  
 Robert B. Sanford, jr.,  
 Charles D. Welker,  
 Rufus H. Bush,  
 John E. Burger,  
 Patrick J. Solon,  
 Francis A. Pippo,  
 Joseph W. Bettens,  
 Frank Bruce,  
 Michael J. Conlon,  
 Henry W. Stratton,  
 Clyde Keene,  
 George C. Smith,  
 William Seyford,  
 Gottlieb Sherer,  
 George E. Maynard,  
 Arthur B. McCrary,  
 Axel Lindblad,  
 Seldon L. Almont,  
 William E. O'Connor,  
 William Twigg, jr.,  
 Frederick R. Kalde,  
 Burton W. Lambert,  
 Allen I. Seaman,  
 William D. Dadd,  
 Charles Swanberg,  
 Malcolm C. Davis,  
 William H. Muehlhause,  
 Leroy Neil,  
 Oscar D. Parker,  
 John A. Ward,  
 John C. Hines,  
 John Gallagher,  
 George W. Robbins,  
 Cyrus S. Hansel,  
 Ernest A. Healy,  
 Frederick G. Keyes,  
 William Eberlin,  
 Frederick Petry,  
 John Meyer,  
 Frederick Evans,  
 Godfrey P. Schurz,  
 Clarence L. Tibbals,  
 Thomas J. Bristol,  
 William Taylor,  
 Daniel F. Mulvihill,  
 Michael J. Bresnahan,  
 Lafayette P. Guy,  
 Edmond Delavy,  
 Frank J. Mayer,  
 Horace de B. Dougherty,  
 James J. Joyce,  
 Fred Rasmussen,  
 Warner K. Bigger,  
 Frank Schultz,  
 Joseph Sperl,  
 Daniel J. Sullivan,  
 David F. Mead,  
 Edwin W. Hill,  
 Henry A. Lowell,  
 Charles Antrobus,  
 Oliver T. Miller,  
 August Logan,  
 John J. Coyle,  
 George F. Blass,  
 Walter S. Belknap,

George C. Lacock,  
 Anton Hengst,  
 John W. Boldt,  
 Fred San Soucie,  
 Claude S. Padgett,  
 Howard H. Chambers,  
 Percy R. Abrams,  
 Vincent F. LeVerne,  
 Charles E. Briggs,  
 George B. Llewellyn,  
 William C. Milligan,  
 Frederick J. Legere,  
 James Reilly,  
 John H. MacDonald,  
 William A. James,  
 William A. Fulkerson,  
 Jerry C. Holmes,  
 Conrad T. Goertz,  
 Edwin R. Wroughton,  
 William E. Cook,  
 Lewis H. Cutting,  
 Ernest L. Jones,  
 William C. Carpenter,  
 Murry Wolfe,  
 Charles L. Greene,  
 Arthur T. Brill,  
 Ward T. Hall,  
 Michael Garland,  
 Erich Richter,  
 John C. Heck,  
 James L. McKenna,  
 George W. Waldo,  
 Anthony E. Bentfeld,  
 Arthur Boquett,  
 John Harder,  
 Sigvart Thompson,  
 Stephen A. Farrell,  
 William A. Vick,  
 John J. Welch,  
 Arthur S. Rollins,  
 Charles C. Stotz,  
 John C. Maxon,  
 Bailey E. Rigg,  
 Walter A. Buckley,  
 Frank E. Nelson,  
 Norman McL. McDonald,  
 Philip S. Flint,  
 Charles W. Wagner,  
 Henry A. Reynolds,  
 George F. Veth,  
 James E. Kemmer,  
 James A. Newell,  
 William W. Holton,  
 Fred C. Wolf,  
 Charles J. Naprstek,  
 Max Bayer,  
 Paxton Hotchkiss,  
 Leon W. Knight,  
 Harry M. Peaco,  
 Henry H. Beck,  
 Frank F. Webster,  
 John Reber,  
 Charles N. Koch,  
 Fred T. Rider,  
 William S. Evans,  
 Sofus K. Sorensen,  
 George J. Romulus,  
 Arthur L. Hecykell,  
 Charles King,  
 Quintus R. Thomson, jr.,  
 Ora A. Martin,  
 John A. Pierce,  
 Stephen Ingham,  
 William R. Spear,  
 William T. Shaw,  
 Roy K. Madill,  
 William R. McFarlane,  
 Nils Anderson,  
 Melvin C. Kent,  
 John E. Armstrong,  
 Albert C. Fraenzel,  
 William A. Martin,  
 Ralph B. Wallace,  
 James Roberts,

Joseph D. Glick,  
 Anthony Prastka,  
 Joseph W. Birk,  
 Edmund D. Duckett,  
 Raymond A. Walker,  
 Hermann Jorgensen,  
 Charles F. Dane,  
 Arthur J. Holton,  
 Vincent Benedict,  
 Ola D. Butler,  
 Edgar C. Wortman,  
 Joseph G. N. Johnson,  
 David Duffy,  
 Clyde H. McLellan,  
 Noel Chatillon,  
 William F. Schlegel,  
 Lee W. Drisco,  
 James J. Delany,  
 William H. Stephenson,  
 Arthur E. Rice,  
 John P. Millon,  
 Frank L. Elkins,  
 Sol Shaw,  
 Ernest J. Leonard,  
 Thomas J. Sullivan,  
 John P. Sasse,  
 Will Mueller,  
 John H. Chase,  
 Will S. Holloway,  
 George J. Blessing,  
 James D. Brown,  
 Patrick H. Cassidy,  
 Frank A. Manuel,  
 Frank Flaherty,  
 Arthur A. F. Aml,  
 Bennett McC. Proctor,  
 James Donaldson,  
 John A. Silva,  
 James Hauser,  
 John E. Sullivan,  
 Charles A. Armstrong,  
 Chauncey R. Doll,  
 James S. Trayer,  
 Gregoire F. J. Labelle,  
 Theodore Andersen,  
 Henry Hartley,  
 Eugene J. Frich,  
 Philip J. Kelly,  
 Alfred Doucet,  
 William E. Benson,  
 Fred C. A. Plagemann,  
 Peter J. Gundlach,  
 Albert M. Hinman,  
 Leon W. Becker,  
 William Cox,  
 Stephen A. Loftus,  
 Herman C. Schrader,  
 Asa V. R. Watson,  
 William A. Eaton,  
 James M. MacDonnell,  
 Herbert R. Mytinger,  
 Harold A. Turner,  
 Charles B. Bradley,  
 Curry E. Eason,  
 Samuel C. Washington,  
 Brice H. Mack,  
 James A. Featherston,  
 Walter N. Fanning,  
 Herbert J. Meneratti,  
 Niels Drustrup,  
 Abraham DeSomer,  
 George Bradley,  
 Donald McDonald,  
 Warren E. Magee,  
 Robert J. Kingsmill,  
 Charles F. Merrill,  
 Charles B. Shackleton,  
 Benjamin F. Ranger,  
 Robert C. McClure,  
 Carl S. Chapman,  
 George C. Martin,  
 Wilmer W. Weber,  
 Mark Strosk,  
 William W. Wilkins,  
 Helge Ohlsson,

Elroy G. True,  
 James W. O'Leary,  
 Warren H. Langdon,  
 Andrew C. Skinner,  
 Emery Smith,  
 Benjamin F. Maddox,  
 George Keeser,  
 John A. Rogers,  
 Alfred E. Raue,  
 John C. Richards,  
 Frank W. Yurasko,  
 Albert H. Mellien,  
 Philip A. Astoria,  
 Thomas A. Graham,  
 William A. Mason,  
 Everest A. Whited,  
 John F. Murphy,  
 Charles A. Kohls,  
 Clarence R. Rockwell,  
 Paul E. Kuter,  
 William E. Snyder,  
 David McWhorter, jr.,  
 George H. Kellogg,  
 Elery A. Zehner,  
 Samuel E. Lee,  
 Frank Stinchcomb,  
 Simon L. Shade,  
 Ludwig W. Gunz,  
 Wildon A. Ott,  
 Hugh W. Nimmo,  
 Junius G. Sanders,  
 Frederick B. Webber,  
 George T. Campbell,  
 Charles A. Dannemann,  
 Harold G. Billings,  
 Albert E. Freed,  
 Frank Kinne,  
 Andrew N. Anderson,  
 Frank C. Nigg,  
 Frank Kerr,  
 Arthur H. Cummings,  
 Harry J. Hansen,  
 Rony Snyder,  
 Newcomb L. Damon,  
 Jack K. Campbell,  
 George Kleinsmith,  
 Albert G. Martin,  
 Daniel McCallum,  
 John M. Buckley,  
 John J. Madden,  
 Robert Semple,  
 Henry H. Fowler,  
 Stanley H. Sacker,  
 Elmer J. McCluen,  
 John M. Kirkpatrick,  
 Clyde Lovelace,  
 Claude B. Arney,  
 Martin Dickinson,  
 Jesse J. Alexander,  
 John J. Enders,  
 Jesse J. Oettinger,  
 William H. Farrel,  
 Thomas M. Buck,  
 John Shottroff,  
 John Whalen,  
 Raymond C. McDuffie,  
 Oscar Benson,  
 William Martin,  
 John S. Conover,  
 Fayette Myers,  
 John G. M. Johnson,  
 Frederick Clifford,  
 Alexander Anderson,  
 Frederick T. Walling,  
 Charles V. Kane,  
 Joseph M. Gately,  
 Joseph H. Gerrior,  
 George S. Dean,  
 Ralph A. Laird, and  
 Charles F. Fielding.

## MARINE CORPS.

Capt. Arthur B. Owens to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of March, 1917.

Capt. Clarke H. Wells to be major in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 22d day of May, 1917.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 26th day of July, 1917:

Harry Paul, and  
William Workman.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of August, 1917:

Frank R. Armstead, and  
Lee H. Brown.

First Lieut. Ethelbert Talbot to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of March, 1917.

The following-named temporary second lieutenant to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps for a probationary period of two years from the 9th day of February, 1918:

Francis B. Reed.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1918.*

##### COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Howard Hathaway to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Hawaii.

##### POSTMASTERS.

##### LOUISIANA.

Clifford C. Anderson, Jr., Lake Arthur.  
Edwin H. Hall, Mooringsport.  
Maggie E. Jones, Ringgold.

##### TENNESSEE.

Robert H. Marley, Arlington.  
Frank P. Singleton, Copperhill.  
O. L. McCallum, Henderson.  
Irene M. Cheairs, Spring Hill.  
Ira LaF. Lemonds, Tiptonville.  
Henry Estill, Winchester.

#### WITHDRAWALS.

*Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate March 1, 1918.*

##### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

*To be colonel with rank from February 6, 1918.*

Lieut. Col. William P. Stokay, Corps of Engineers.

*To be colonel with rank from February 7, 1918.*

Lieut. Col. Lewis M. Adams, Corps of Engineers.

*To be colonel with rank from February 8, 1918.*

Lieut. Col. William D'A. Anderson, Corps of Engineers.

### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, March 1, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Dr. George F. Duncan, pastor Hermon Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Father of all, to whom we come but unto Thee? Thou art our Creator, our Preserver, and our Redeemer. In Thee we live, move, and have our being. From Thee cometh down every good and perfect gift. May Thy name be hallowed in the session of this day. Give every one of these, Thy servants, a double portion of Thy spirit, leading them into all truth. May all that they do, say, and think be in harmony with Thy holy will, and so for the best good of our beloved land. Grant all these mercies with the forgiveness of all our sins, which we ask in the name of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 10296), authorizing the Post Office Department to acquire and extend the telephone system, and so forth, was introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky on the 27th day of this month. The bill is essentially the same as the one the House passed upon yesterday. I move to change the reference from the Committee on the District of Columbia to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Just a word, Mr. Speaker. The bill, in my judgment, should go to the Committee on the District of Columbia, but there is not enough difference between this bill and the one voted upon yesterday, and therefore I shall enter into no contest about the matter.

The question was taken, and the motion to rerefer was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. MAPES was granted leave of absence on account of death in his family.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. MASON, on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by publishing in the RECORD a patriotic address delivered by Mr. JAMES, of Michigan, on Washington's Birthday.

The SPEAKER. Delivered by whom?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a patriotic address made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES]. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not expect to object, but did the gentleman make a similar request yesterday?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I did two days ago, and it was objected to by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. FESS. To submit a request for unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by my colleague L. W. FAIRFIELD, of Indiana, here in the city of Washington on Abraham Lincoln on the anniversary of his birth.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by Mr. FAIRFIELD, of Indiana, upon Lincoln, somewhere in town. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by having printed a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue giving his ruling upon the question of the taxation of Congressmen's salaries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, explaining some features of the tax bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, is this letter directed to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does it hold that Congressmen's salaries are taxable?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KITCHIN. Has the gentleman from Kansas any objection to putting in his remarks the Treasury decision on that subject, too?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. That is included in the letter. It gives the ruling he has made in the body of the letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL CONTROL OF RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew the request I made yesterday for unanimous consent to insist on the House amendment to the Senate railroad bill and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the railroad bill, S. 3752, and insist on the House amendments, and ask for a conference. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees: Mr. SIMS, Mr. DOREMUS, and Mr. ESCH.

#### REPORT OF PNEUMATIC-TUBE SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a report of the commission appointed to investigate the pneumatic-tube service, and ask that the same be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia presents the report of the Pneumatic-Tube Service Commission, and asks unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the right to object so far as the request obtains to printing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There have been other reports on this same subject in former Congresses, but they were never printed in the RECORD. This report will be printed as a document and be available to everyone who wishes to obtain a copy. I can not see any especial need for printing this report in the RECORD.

Mr. BELL. I will say to the gentleman that the report is short, embodying only a few pages of typewritten matter, and I think it would be of interest to print this report in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five days in which to prepare a minority report on this same matter. I am a member of the commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for permission to file a minority report on the same subject within five legislative days. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to make an inquiry as to my right to unanimous consent, apparently granted, but perhaps afterwards denied. Wednesday, February 27, as shown on page 2768, I asked unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the so-called alien-slacker bill. The Speaker asked:

Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Another gentleman then made a similar request, and objection was then made. The Speaker then said:

Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON]?

To which the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] replied that he objected to them all. To avoid a misunderstanding, I now renew the request, as of that date.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to print an extension of a speech in the RECORD on the alien-slacker bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The extension of the remarks already made.

The SPEAKER. An extension of the remarks already made. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### DR. GARFIELD AND THE FUEL ORDER.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] has leave to address the House for not more than 30 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to discuss in the time allotted to me the recent fuel order, the reasons for it, and what it accomplished.

On the 17th day of January, acting under authority granted by the Congress, Dr. Harry A. Garfield, the Fuel Administrator, issued an order, effective the next day, limiting the operation of industries whose output was not essential for war purposes, providing for the closing of places of amusement, stores, office buildings, and so forth. The fuelless days covered five consecutive days, commencing with January 18. At the expiration of that time Monday of each week was designated as fuelless day, or heatless day, through the month of February and until the 25th day of March. The order has now been rescinded, and we have had eight fuelless days. A continuation of the order, however, is authorized in the New England States, subject to the decision of the local fuel administrators there. The time has come to examine into the reasons for the order and what has been accomplished by it.

#### OPPOSITION IN CONGRESS.

The promulgation of the order, on the 17th day of January, provoked bitter speeches in both Houses of the Congress. On this floor gentlemen with no facts at all in their possession proceeded to bitterly criticize the Fuel Administration. It was insisted that the extreme cold and the ice and the snow did not interfere with the loading or unloading of coal. One gentleman insisted that he came from the coldest corner of the United States and cold weather never interfered with the unloading of coal. Another gentleman insisted that the proper way to unload coal was simply to thaw out the cars with steam jets—the inference being that a competent administrator would have accomplished it in that way. Another gentleman with frenzied oratory declared that if this order was necessary we had lost the first battle in this war. It was insisted that declarations of this kind constituted constructive criticism. An ex-Attorney General of the United States, who signed his name as Attorney General of the

United States in President Taft's Cabinet issued at once a statement saturated with partisanship, reaching a lower level in the matter of partisan criticism than has yet been reached. This effusion was entitled "The limit of forbearance passed." It appeared in a New York newspaper, and the conference committee on national preparedness, of which Henry A. Wisewood is chairman, had it reprinted and distributed widely throughout the country. This conference committee may have rendered some good service, but by distributing this particular article they have done their very best to give aid and comfort to the enemy. An organization claiming to be patriotic, which uses its funds for the distribution of a partisan document like this has certainly almost passed its period of usefulness as an instrument of patriotism. Speeches made in this House that day—none of them were made on the Democratic side—will not be dropped from airplanes inside the German lines, and this effusion from an ex-Attorney General of the United States, if it gets into Germany at all, will be sent there by German agencies and will splendidly encourage German armies in the present crisis.

#### DR. GARFIELD.

The impression created by the speeches here and by partisan newspapers throughout the country is that Dr. Garfield is a college president and nothing more—that he gets his information as to conditions by peering out upon the world from the alcoves of college libraries. A strong partisan attempt has been made to create the impression that Dr. Garfield is absolutely incompetent, that he knows nothing at all about coal or about business of any kind, and that the appointment of incompetent men is made by the President for the reason that he prefers to be surrounded by men of small caliber—that the President himself is an able Executive with a splendid vision, and that his weakness consists in the alleged fact that he surrounds himself with men who are not qualified for the discharge of the duties they perform.

No President of the United States from the time of George Washington has exercised better judgment in the selection of men to discharge important duties, and the success of his administration is to a very large extent due to the splendid judgment exercised at all times by the President in the selection of the men he has appointed for the discharge of important duties. The time has come for the people to get acquainted with Dr. Garfield. I knew him in the old college days when he was a student in the college in New England of which he is now President and when I was a student at another institution not far away, and I have had occasion to observe his career during the years that have passed since then. He is a college president; no man is better entitled to be called "doctor" than he. Four great colleges empowered to confer degrees have conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of laws. He is a member of all the learned societies. These facts, however, do not seem to appeal to the critics of this administration. The fact that he is an educated, cultured gentleman in the prime of life, with a carefully trained mind, is used by partisan critics as strong evidence of the fact that he is especially disqualified for the discharge of the duties of the important office he now holds.

Dr. Garfield is a lawyer, and a lawyer of marked ability. No man in the United States better understands the business of operating coal mines. In a section of Ohio 30 miles from railroads he developed a coal mine, having organized a company for that purpose—a particularly rich mine overlooked by coal operators for the reason that it was remote from railroads, but Dr. Garfield, after arranging for the development of the mine, with splendid executive ability organized a company and built a railroad 30 miles long, connecting up the mine he had developed with the great railroad systems of the country.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Not just now. Later on, if I have the time, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Dr. Garfield organized the Cleveland Trust Co., at the present time one of the great trust companies of the country, and Cleveland capitalists and business men and wage earners had enough confidence in his business ability to deposit with his trust company \$20,000,000 in cash; and this great company holds also \$120,000,000 in securities. He built an office building, one of the most important in Cleveland, in which to house the trust company. This great trust company now has 15 branches. The business men of Cleveland, his neighbors and his friends, have so much confidence in his business ability that they elected him president of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, and he discharged the duties of that position with marked ability. He also acted as president of the Municipal Association of Cleveland.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. RAINEY. I will be glad to yield later on. I can not yield now. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

I have said enough about Dr. Garfield to call attention to his accomplishments along the lines of practical business affairs. I undertake to say that no man in the country can be found who can better discharge the duties of Fuel Administrator than Dr. Garfield, who has been made the subject of so much unreasonable criticism and partisan abuse. When Dr. Garfield issued an order shutting off the heat from stores and office buildings he shut off the heat from the office building he had built himself. He regulated the coal trade of a coal mine he had himself made possible over a railroad he had built himself. He made an order affecting the business men who had been his associates all his life. No man was better qualified than he to understand the necessity for the order and its effect.

THE FUEL-CONTROL ORGANIZATION BUILT UP BY DR. GARFIELD AND MR. P. B. NOYES.

Dr. Garfield selected as one of his assistants to become the Director of the Conservation Bureau of the Fuel Administrator's office Mr. P. B. Noyes, of New York. Mr. Noyes's duties also included the necessary limitation of industries. With reference to Mr. Noyes, I might state that he has been for 23 years the general manager of the Oneida Co. (Ltd.), which manufactures silverware and other things—one of the great manufacturing establishments of the country—and for the last eight years he has also been President of that company. The American Hardware Manufacturers' Association is one of our most important commercial organizations. This great organization had enough confidence in Mr. Noyes as a business man to elect him President, and he served in this position with distinction. He entered Dr. Garfield's office two or three weeks after the appointment of Dr. Garfield and has been with him ever since. An effort has been made to create the impression out through the country that these prominent business men are merely ordinary job seekers, holding the positions they hold on account of the salary and emoluments connected therewith. As a matter of fact neither Dr. Garfield nor Mr. Noyes draw any salary. They have tendered their services to the Government for nothing—or, rather, their compensation has been fixed at a dollar a year, and there is no provision of law by which they can ever hope to collect even the dollar. They are patriotic, conscientious gentlemen, anxious to serve their country. They have both given up their private business and the important positions they held and have made tremendous sacrifices and have come to Washington to serve their country without financial compensation. The heads of the various bureaus established by Dr. Garfield in his department are composed of distinguished citizens especially qualified for the duties they are called upon to perform. I undertake to say that in the history of this country no man has been subjected to such unreasonable and unreasoning criticism as Dr. Garfield, but during all this period of storm and stress he and his assistants in the great organization he has built up have been quietly proceeding, discharging their duties without making the slightest attempt to defend themselves personally against the shafts of unfair and unjust criticism hurled at them. This is one of the men who have been criticized as amateurs in business, as incompetent men. Dr. Garfield built up his organization, built it up from the ground. There were no precedents to follow.

Dr. Garfield surrounded himself with men who are not amateurs in the coal business; he brought down here Mr. Rembrandt Peale, one of the leading coal operators of the country; Mr. L. A. Sneed, a man who had been in the coal business from his youth up; Mr. John White, president of the United Mine Workers; Mr. William Diamond, another leader in the Mine Workers; Mr. H. D. Nims, an authority on trade law; and Prof. S. A. Taylor, a prominent mining engineer, together with Mr. Noyes, whom I have already mentioned.

I might describe also the splendid qualifications of this cabinet of experts, but I do not have the time to do so.

#### COAL PRODUCTION IN 1917.

We produced in 1900, 269,000,000 tons of coal, including both bituminous coal and anthracite coal. From that period until the calendar year 1917 the production of coal in the United States has increased about 17,000,000 tons per year, and the railroads have adjusted their transportation systems to an increase of about that much each year. During the calendar year 1917, however, our increase in the production of coal over prior years was 64,000,000 tons. As it usually happens, it was necessary to move the greater part of this during the latter half of the year. The production of coal is and must always be a question of transportation. A coal shortage in the ordinary acceptance of the term is as impossible in this country as a shortage of sand or of limestone rock. In our 7,000 coal mines we can always produce as much coal as can be transported over our railroads. In order

to understand how much 64,000,000 tons of coal is I have made a computation. Coal cars vary in length from 52 feet to 41 feet. The average length of a coal car is 38 feet. Allowing 3 feet of space between each car, it would require three trains of cars extending across the continent from New York to San Francisco to contain 64,000,000 tons of coal. In addition to these three trains extending across the continent there would be still another train extending from New York to St. Louis. This was the extra coal burden the railroads were called upon to assume in 1917 and this was not the only burden the railroads were called upon to discharge. Our export trade had been speeded up from \$2,000,000,000 in value in four years to \$9,000,000,000. In 1917 we exported \$9,000,000,000 worth of manufactured goods—more than three times as much as any nation ever exported before in the history of the world. It was necessary for railroads to carry these goods from the place of manufacture to the sea, and this of itself would be an unprecedented increase in the burdens upon the railroad systems of any country. In addition to all this, the increased prosperity of the country brought with it in 1916 and especially in 1917 an enormously increased home consumption of foodstuffs and manufactured goods to be transported on our railroads. This was the condition of affairs when Dr. Garfield assumed control of the coal situation of the country in August, 1917. When he assumed control the production of coal was at its lowest mark. During the week preceding his appointment we produced less coal in the United States than was produced during any week of the year 1916. He immediately, by appealing to the patriotism of coal operators and their employees, commenced to increase the production and the distribution of coal. From that time on the production of coal increased until it largely exceeded the production of 1916. On the 8th day of December winter commenced, and winter commenced just at the time when there was a tremendously increased production of war material and of supplies of all kinds needed by our troops in France. The number of men we were sending increased with each passing week. Our transportation system became clogged by our own enormous strength as a manufacturing Nation. Our production was abnormal and the railroads were feeling in December the destructive force of our abnormal production. Our transportation system was breaking down. By the middle of January our lines of communication with France were absolutely destroyed, but not by submarines. Every ship loaded with our khaki-clad soldiers was being safely conveyed through the danger zone. Every ship loaded with supplies was safely reaching its destination, but the abnormal production of the country, our enormous export trade, our unprecedented interstate traffic occasioned by increased consumption in the United States, the demands of factories, every one of them running with full strength every day in the week, and thousands of them running all night long with three shifts of men each 24 hours, demanding, as manufacturing energy of this kind would demand, a great increased supply of coal; all of this strain, absolutely without a precedent in the history of this or any other nation, clogged our transportation systems. We need an increase of 5,000 locomotives every year in order to meet the increased demands on us. We have not been getting half that many; we have been supplying locomotives to France and to Russia. One-half of the thousands of cars at railroad terminals and filling sidetracks were cars loaded with coal, and then there came, increasing our difficulties, the intense cold of the middle of last month and the snow and the ice which accompanied it. Chesapeake Bay, a great coal highway, was frozen up for the first time within the memory of men now living. Great battleships were used for the purpose of breaking the ice in New York Harbor. In the stockyards district of Chicago an army of men were at work clearing away the snow and the ice. Passenger trains came into Chicago 8 to 12 hours late covered with ice, each one of them drawn by three great locomotive engines. All over the country rails were breaking under heavy trains. In New York Harbor and at Norfolk 250 great merchant ships were awaiting folk in order to sail out into the seas bringing to our own troops and to our allies in the war zone necessary supplies. It was of most vital importance to coal these ships at once and start them on their journey. The entire story can not now be told. After the war is over it will be possible to give all the reasons for the coal order of January 17 last.

Under the stress of congressional criticism too much has already been disclosed with reference to the movement of troops and munitions across the Atlantic, and with reference to other matters which should have been kept from our enemies. When the whole story is told, as it will be told after the war, there will be gentlemen, now Members of this House, who would be glad to expunge from the Record if they could the speeches they made immediately after the promulgation

of the coal order. A delay of five days was absolutely impossible and inadvisable from every standpoint. I can not discuss the matter along this line further. As far as I am concerned I never expect to be the vehicle through which information which ought to be kept secret reaches the enemy.

#### FALLING OFF IN MOVEMENT OF WAR MATERIAL.

On account of the clogging of our railroads, not only was the production and shipment of coal falling off by the middle of January, but the shipment of steel plates and steel bars so much needed for the great new fleet we are building had fallen off 50 per cent. It is impossible to build ships in our shipyards without steel plates and steel bars, but more alarming still was the falling off in the shipment of projectile steel, needed for the manufacture of munitions. This had fallen off by the middle of January 45 per cent.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. RAINEY. If I have the time I will yield later.

#### WHAT THE COAL CONSERVATION ORDER ACCOMPLISHED.

The relief brought about by the order was immediately apparent. Every ship ready to sail in our ports in less than one week after January 17 had been bunkered and had started on its journey across the seas. As the result of the coal order it has been possible to load and to coal, since January 17, 480 ships. These ships carried 2,000,000 tons of food and war supplies. Forty of them were loaded with food, 71 were loaded with coal, oil, and gasoline, and 369 of them were loaded with munitions. Nearly every one of them has safely reached its destination. These supplies so necessary for the winning of the war are being now distributed to our own armies and to the armies of our allies in the war zone of France. The movement of steel plates and steel bars, and projectile steel, has rapidly again become normal. Freight is reaching its destination. The situation is relieved. Our overburdened railroad systems are again functioning.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask unanimous consent for 15 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES AND PLANS OF THE UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATION.

Mr. RAINEY. It is an easy matter for an executive officer to take possession of a department in normal times which has been organized and in operation for a long period of time. A department of that kind will almost run itself. Dr. Garfield's task was to build up a department in an abnormal period. In the most wasteful nation in the world, unaccustomed to conservation of economies of any character, it was his task to reorganize the coal-distribution system of the country and to establish a system of coal conservation. In spite of our unprecedented increase in production of coal there is still a coal shortage of 50,000,000 tons. Obviously this shortage can be overcome in only two ways: First, by building immediately more coal cars and more engines. Ten thousand more engines would hardly equal the demand considered in connection with the other demands upon our railroads. The other way to meet the coal shortage is to conserve coal. Dr. Garfield and his able assistants have organized a campaign in that direction. The coal industry has always been in this country a disorganized business. The task which confronts him is greater than any task ever undertaken by an executive officer prior to our entry into this war, and at the present time no executive officer of this Government has undertaken greater or more important duties than the duties which Dr. Garfield is conscientiously and ably discharging. He is blazing his own trail as he goes along—there are no precedents to help him—not much information of value at his command, except the information he is collecting himself. He has started a campaign for conservation of coal in the homes of the land, where we consume 120,000,000 tons of coal each year. By conserving coal in the homes—firing the furnaces and stoves more carefully, saving a shovelful a day, and more than that—it is estimated we will be able to save 12,000,000 tons every year, and Dr. Garfield has perfected an organization to bring about this result. In 250,000 locomotives and stationary steam plants throughout the country we consume approximately 400,000,000 tons of coal. Under a competent engineer, an organization is being perfected to educate firemen of locomotives and in stationary steam plants in the use of coal, and it is estimated that in this way 40,000,000 tons of coal can be saved per year. Under another bureau a campaign to encourage the substitution of wood for coal is being carried on. About 1½ cords of wood are equal to 1 ton of coal. It is estimated that an increase in the consumption of wood of 10,000,000 cords can be accomplished this year, and this would save 6,000,000 tons of coal. By consolidating public utilities plants and using natural ice, in which it is estimated

now 50,000,000 tons are consumed, it is expected that 3,500,000 tons can be saved. By prohibiting advertising signs and unnecessary out-of-door lighting, at least 500,000 tons can be saved. The daylight-saving bill, which is being advocated by Dr. Garfield, will save a million tons of coal a year. By a natural reduction of building material this year, it is estimated 6,000,000 tons can be saved. It has been proven by investigations made by Dr. Garfield's department that it takes three times as much power to start a loaded trolley car as it does to run it one block, and Dr. Garfield has perfected, for the use of the street railway systems of the country, a plan by which 1,500,000 tons of coal can be saved each year by skip-stops—that is, stopping every other block.

I have enumerated some of the plans now being worked out and developed by the various bureaus of Dr. Garfield's department for the conservation of coal, and I have called attention to plans which are now in the process of development and which when developed fully will conserve over 70,000,000 tons of coal. Other methods are being planned and developed. We can not in war time conserve too much coal.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. RANDALL. The breweries of the country are using 3,000,000 tons of coal a year. Does the gentleman know whether Dr. Garfield intends to try to save any of that?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know.

Mr. LONDON. The product of the brewery supplies a certain kind of heat also, does it not?

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman may be able to qualify as an expert on that. I can not.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Does the gentleman regard the order and advice that emanated from the Fuel Department last summer to the effect that the people should not purchase their coal at that time, that the price would be lower, shows any special qualification on the part of the Fuel Administrator?

Mr. RAINEY. That is a part of the misinformation with which some Members of this House have loaded themselves, and that is a part of the misinformation which was disseminated yesterday on the floor of the Senate. The Fuel Administration never made such an order as that.

Mr. BLAND. Who did, in connection with the Fuel Administration?

Mr. RAINEY. Nobody on the part of the Fuel Administration ever made such an order as that.

Mr. BLAND. Or statement to that effect.

Mr. RAINEY. The gentleman who interrupts me might have done it.

Mr. BLAND. Oh, no; the gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know. I did not do it, but no such advice came from this great department of this Government, and no advice ever came from this department not to buy coal last fall. When this department was organized on the 22d day of last August the production of coal had reached during the previous week a lower mark than it had reached during any week in 1916, and by appealing to the patriotism of operators and their employees in this country the production of coal commenced immediately to increase until just a few days, a few weeks after the appointment of Dr. Garfield the production was again normal and proceeding along the 1916 lines.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. If Dr. Garfield issued no statement that people should not buy coal last summer, why did he not correct the statement that was accredited to him to that effect in practically every paper in the United States?

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, thousands of letters were written from Dr. Garfield's department. Every man who wrote to that department asking if they had better wait to buy their coal received a negative reply, thousands of them throughout this country.

Mr. LITTLE. How did it happen that none of them were ever printed in a newspaper, but that, on the contrary, the newspapers widely spread the statement that he told the people not to buy?

Mr. RAINEY. Because the newspapers of this country prefer to be sensational, and the way to be sensational is to misrepresent things.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I live in the center of one of the greatest coal fields in the world. There has never been a moment since that order was issued nor for a long period before that that we could not have shipped out twice as much coal as we were doing,

and we had it ready to ship if we had the cars in which to ship it.

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, there is no question about that.

Mr. LANGLEY. How did this fuel order conserve coal in a situation like that? It hurt us there without helping anybody, as it looks to me.

Mr. RAINEY. Oh, I can not yield any further. The gentleman has not been listening to me. He does not appreciate the fact that my argument is that the production of coal is absolutely a question of transportation, and I have been discussing the question of transportation here all the time.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what the Official Bulletin had to say on this thing at that time?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman does not know whether it was silent or whether it said something?

Mr. RAINEY. I do not know anything about it.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said that the exports increased from \$2,000,000,000 to \$9,000,000,000.

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; in four years.

Mr. LONDON. To what extent does the increase represent an increase in bulk?

Mr. RAINEY. I am unable to answer the gentleman's question.

I have attempted to call attention to the facts. The country ought to know what the facts are. In spite of violent criticism on this floor, the country is loyally responding to the demands of the present situation. Fortunately, the speeches made here have been absolutely without effect. While violent criticisms, unsustained by any facts, were being launched from this floor on the 17th day of January, telegrams of acquiescence in the order were being received by the President of the United States and by Dr. Garfield. While, on the other side of this House, Representatives from Northern States were denouncing the Coal Administrator, from the very heart of the South, from the great industrial city of Atlanta, Ga., there came to the Fuel Administrator a telegram announcing that the merchants and the manufacturers of Atlanta in a mass meeting held on that day had passed resolutions agreeing to abide strictly by the conservation order. This expression of loyalty and patriotism was the first to reach this Capital after the promulgation of the order, and then from cities and villages, from great banking institutions, from manufacturers throughout the land, there came floods of telegrams, all pledging full performance of the fuel order. The country was loyal—the order was observed—the results are apparent—the first battle has been won. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. LONDON. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the railroad bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD on the railroad bill.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman has that right anyway.

Mr. LONDON. I did extend my remarks as delivered on the floor, but I want to insert some historical data as a separate extension.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have not already gotten unanimous consent may have leave to extend their remarks on the alien slacker bill.

The SPEAKER. For how long?

Mr. BURNETT. For five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen be permitted to extend their remarks on the alien slacker bill for five legislative days. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

#### PENSIONS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 10027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio calls up the bill H. R. 10027 and asks unanimous consent that it be considered

in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10027) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Alfred Cooper, late of Company I, One hundred and ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. J. Little, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Arthur R. Pratt, late of Company B, Seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Milton Inners, helpless and dependent child of Hamilton Inners, late of Company K, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John J. Moll, alias James Moore, late of Company A, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Katin, late of Company I, Twenty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac Low, late of Company I, Two hundred and seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Reid, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Abbott, late of Company H, Sixth Provisional Enrolled Missouri Militia Infantry, and Sixteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter A. Scott, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phoebe A. Jones, widow of Benjamin Jones, late of Company A, Tenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Spears, late of Companies I and A, Thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Seneff, late of Company D, Ninety-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard Starr, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Harper, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi G. Hake, late of Company D, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel A. Ham, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel E. Scott, late of Company I, Ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louis Dixon, late of Company A, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Finley, late of Company A, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Tipple, late of Company G, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Austin P. Jones, late of Company A, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas M. Lanning, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Cason, late of Company A, First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Richardson, late of Company D, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis M. Kirkpatrick, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Taylor Johnson, late of Company G, Forty-second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gilbert Scarbrough, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Hale, late of Company K, Ninety-fifth Regiment, and Company D, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry P. Bradbury, late of Company G, Seventy-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leander H. Prather, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William T. Hobbs, late of Fourth Battery, Iowa Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isom S. Reeder, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Dettmer, late of Company K, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Guy, late of Company A, Forty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henderson Morgan, late of Company D, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Chapman, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Mealy, late of Company F, Eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James O. Grant, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anna M. Barrett, widow of William Barrett, late of Company C, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William J. Barnett, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Leonidas W. Day, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Almada King, former widow of Robert E. Porter, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of James M. Shuey, late of Company H, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Winters, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John O. Harmon, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander B. Grosh, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George A. Parks, late of Company A, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert F. Hart, late of Company A, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Hertz, late of Company K, Two hundredth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Landon C. Campbell, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Richard H. Stinemates, late of Company G, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas Waters, late of Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George C. Smith, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Byron Truesdell, late of Company B, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Coleman, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John McComas, late of Battery B, West Virginia Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jordan Johnson, late of Company I, Twenty-eighth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aretus F. Loomis, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Spear T. Harmon, late of Company A, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francisco Brown, late of Company A, Eighty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Theodore G. Carlisle, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pliny Gerow, late of Company I, One hundred and eighteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Thayer, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and One hundred and first Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis B. Rex, late of Company E, Seventy-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius C. Wing, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Maria Miller, widow of Jesse Miller, late acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John H. Eversole, late of Company I, One hundred and seventy-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred Holmes, late of Company K, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of J. Comly Rich, late of Company G, One hundred and ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edith King, widow of William J. King, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John F. Newman, late of Company B, Tenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Smolinski, late of Company M, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Baxter Hamilton, late of Company C, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Lydick, widow of Samuel A. Lydick, late of Company K, One hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Andrew Emmert, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company E, Sixth Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Bubb, late of Company F, First Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Ellis, late of the United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Kepner, late of Company G, Seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary J. Titus, widow of Francis J. M. Titus, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of David W. Farington, late of Company F, Second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hamilton B. Pate, late of Company G, One hundred and forty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sylvester C. Loveless, late of Company G, Seventy-second Regiment, and Company I, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William E. Hanigan, late of Company D, Twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Lamar, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Himes, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter S. Huffman, late of band, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Moore, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram B. Dillon, late of Company H, Ninth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaiah W. Wilmett, late of Company B, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Varnell, late of Company I, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Phebe A. Shisler, former widow of George W. Shisler, late of Company F, Fifty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of William D. McCormick, late of Company E, Seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Pope, late of Company F, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Abraham Rapelye, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Merit L. Williams, late of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gustavus Odor, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Moore, late of Company F, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Twelfth Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Lattimore, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Walter W. McGehee, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ida E. Jones, widow of William A. T. Jones, late of Company E, Sixty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Alfred Hazen, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Von Dissen, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Kooney, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Roup, late of Company H, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James J. Mitchell, late of Company C, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment Pennsylvania Drafted Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Higdon, late of Company F, Purnell Legion, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Price, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harvey N. Connerly, late of Company K, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Decker, late of Company D, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mortimer Johns, late of Company B, Ninety-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Archibald Branaugh, late of Company C, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Chester P. Tryon, late of Company E, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Bright, late of Company F, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Stackhouse, late of Company B, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joshua Westbrook, late of Company K, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Cunningham, late of Company F, Second Battalion, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alvin O. Thayer, late of Company K, Twenty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert J. Davis, late of Company I, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George S. Armstrong, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias Baker, late of Company B, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen Higgins, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Brumage, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jonathan Bondy, late of Company H, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Owen Moore, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Calvin Miller, late of Company G, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tilman Lilly, late of Company M, Seventeenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Bungard, late of Company E, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob McKnight, late of Company B, Fifty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius L. Leport, late of Company C, Second Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Woodson, widow of John M. Woodson, late of Company B, Eighty-second Regiment, and Company C, Twenty-second Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Clyde Woodson, helpless and dependent child of said John M. Woodson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary Woodson, the name of said Clyde Woodson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Mary Woodson.

The name of Jerome B. Summers, late of Company D, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel T. Dowdle, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie L. Marksbury, widow of James W. Marksbury, late of Company G, Thirty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Austin A. Bierce, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Hunter, late of Company C, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Price, late of Company B, Eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Carson, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Trimble, late of Company H, One hundred and fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rosella Magee, helpless and dependent child of James Magee, late of Company I, Sixty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Anderson Bandy, late of Company E, Fourteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert S. McCreary, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Brenaman, late of Company F, Third Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melissa C. Lewis, former widow of Eugene Risley, late of Company C, Twenty-fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of Louis Lady, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George B. McKechnie, late of Company I, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Johnson, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elam Welch, late of Company M, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Vanscyoc, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment, and Company C, Tenth Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Louisa M. Robinson, former widow of Jesse Robinson, late of Company C, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Engineers and Mechanics, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The name of John Stockwell, late of Company K, Seventy-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Smith, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jasper N. Cooper, late of Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. McKinley, late of Company G, One hundred and thirty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hezekiah Miller, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Guilford D. Taylor, late of Company C, Third Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lester N. Porter, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matthew McGoldrick, late of Company H, Ninety-ninth Regiment New York National Guard Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George J. Wright, late of Company D, Seventy-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus B. Tickner, late of Company D, Eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas J. Holman, late of Company A, Forty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob W. Cline, late of Company D, Forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Fox, late of Company G, Second Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nicholas Long, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Squire Grissom, late of Company G, Forty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Baty Cecil, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Erastus A. Kelly, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eugene L. Houghton, late of Company I, Thirty-sixth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram J. Pittsberger, late of Company E, Fortieth and Fifty-first Regiments Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John M. Willoughby, late of Company G, Fifty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Morris Springfield, late of Company C, Fifty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry D. Combs, late of Company E, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha Wilson, widow of Henry Wilson, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$37 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Harvey M. Wilson, helpless and dependent child of said Henry Wilson, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha Wilson the name of said Harvey M. Wilson shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the death of said Martha Wilson.

The name of John M. Thorn, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Collins, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lemuel Jones, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 608. Alfred Cooper.	H. R. 7889. Hiram B. Dillon.
H. R. 865. George H. J. Little.	H. R. 7901. Isalah W. Wilmeth.
H. R. 866. Arthur R. Pratt.	H. R. 7932. Albert Varnell.
H. R. 876. Milton Inners.	H. R. 7938. Phebe A. Shisler.
H. R. 920. John J. Moll, alias	H. R. 7941. William F. McCormick.
James Moore.	H. R. 7952. William W. Pope.
H. R. 1004. Michael Katin.	H. R. 7965. Abraham Rapelye.
H. R. 1030. Isaac Low.	H. R. 8037. Merit L. Williams.
H. R. 1384. John Reid.	H. R. 8137. Gustavus Odor.
H. R. 1491. John W. Abbott.	H. R. 8140. James W. Moore.
H. R. 1552. Walter A. Scott.	H. R. 8167. John Lattimore.
H. R. 1776. Phoebe A. Jones.	H. R. 8176. Walter W. McGeehe.
H. R. 1799. John Spears.	H. R. 8178. Ida A. Jones.
H. R. 1938. John C. Seneff.	H. R. 8190. Alfred Hazen.
H. R. 1987. Richard Starr.	H. R. 8194. Frederick Von Dissen.
H. R. 1988. William Harper.	H. R. 8232. James A. Kooney.
H. R. 2259. Levi G. Hake.	H. R. 8234. William Roup.
H. R. 2456. Samuel A. Ham.	H. R. 8235. James J. Mitchell.
H. R. 2516. Samuel E. Scott.	H. R. 8241. John W. Higdon.
H. R. 2554. Louis Dixon.	H. R. 8250. John H. Price.
H. R. 2557. James Finley.	H. R. 8264. Harvey N. Connerly.
H. R. 2569. Francis M. Tippie.	H. R. 8265. William W. Decker.
H. R. 2639. Austin P. Jones.	H. R. 8365. Mortimer Johns.
H. R. 2801. Silas M. Lanning.	H. R. 8440. Archibald Bramaugh.
H. R. 3170. John B. Cason.	H. R. 8447. Chester P. Tryon.
H. R. 3171. David Richardson.	H. R. 8540. John H. Bright.
H. R. 3250. Francis M. Kirkpatrick.	H. R. 8581. Charles Stackhouse.
H. R. 3432. Taylor Johnson.	H. R. 8593. Joshua Westbrook.
H. R. 3489. Gilbert Scarbrough.	H. R. 8597. Albert Cunningham.
H. R. 3586. Andrew Hale.	H. R. 8675. Alvin O. Thayer.
H. R. 3589. Henry P. Bradbury.	H. R. 8705. Albert C. Davis.
H. R. 3698. Leander H. Prather.	H. R. 8775. George S. Armstrong.
H. R. 3915. William T. Hobbs.	H. R. 8870. Elias Baker.
H. R. 3984. Isom S. Reeder.	H. R. 8871. Stephen Higgins.
H. R. 4053. George Dettmer.	H. R. 8874. James W. Brumage.
H. R. 4277. Levi Guy.	H. R. 8901. Jonathan Bondy.
H. R. 4476. Hendersn Morgan.	H. R. 8902. Owen Moore.
H. R. 4505. George Chapman.	H. R. 8903. Calvin Miller.
H. R. 4786. Charles W. Mealy.	H. R. 8906. Tilman Lilly.
H. R. 4840. James O. Grant.	H. R. 8932. John R. Bungard.
H. R. 4890. Anna M. Barrett.	H. R. 8944. Jacob McKnight.
H. R. 4963. William J. Barnett.	H. R. 8994. Cornelius L. Leport.
H. R. 5060. Leonidas W. Day.	H. R. 8999. Mary Woodson.
H. R. 5127. Almeda King.	H. R. 9006. Jerome B. Summers.
H. R. 5179. James M. Shuey.	H. R. 9007. Samuel T. Dowdle.
H. R. 5385. Henry Winters.	H. R. 9029. Annie L. Marksberry.
H. R. 5386. John O. Harmon.	H. R. 9058. Austin A. Bierce.
H. R. 5500. Alexander B. Grosh.	H. R. 9109. John W. Hunter.
H. R. 5505. George A. Parks.	H. R. 9128. Henry Price.
H. R. 5512. Robert F. Hart.	H. R. 9131. William W. Carson.
H. R. 5730. William H. Hertz.	H. R. 9139. Charles H. Trumble.
H. R. 5770. Landon C. Campbell.	H. R. 9141. Rosella Magee.
H. R. 5977. Richard H. Stinemates.	H. R. 9175. Anderson Bandy.
H. R. 5978. Silas Waters.	H. R. 9187. Robert S. McCreary.
H. R. 6067. George C. Smith.	H. R. 9192. Martin Brenaman.
H. R. 6081. Byron Truesdell.	H. R. 9200. Melissa C. Lewis.
H. R. 6084. William J. Coleman.	H. R. 9229. Louis Lady.
H. R. 6191. John McComas.	H. R. 9233. George B. McKechnie.
H. R. 6539. Jordan Johnson.	H. R. 9242. David Johnson.
H. R. 6681. Aretus F. Loomis.	H. R. 9261. Elma Welch.
H. R. 6682. Spear T. Harmon.	H. R. 9264. Josiah Vanscyoc.
H. R. 6693. Francisco Brown.	H. R. 9272. Louisa M. Robinson.
H. R. 6821. Theodore G. Carlisle.	H. R. 9300. John Stockwell.
H. R. 6861. Pliny Gerow.	H. R. 9305. Samuel Smith.
H. R. 6866. James M. Thayer.	H. R. 9307. Jasper N. Cooper.
H. R. 6911. Lewis B. Rex.	H. R. 9308. John W. McKinley.
H. R. 6916. Cornelius C. Wing.	H. R. 9317. Hezekiah Miller.
H. R. 6922. Maria Miller.	H. R. 9338. Guilford D. Taylor.
H. R. 7054. John H. Eversole.	H. R. 9423. Lester N. Porter.
H. R. 7217. Alfred Holmes.	H. R. 9425. Matthew McGoldrick.
H. R. 7369. J. Comly Rich.	H. R. 9428. George J. Wright.
H. R. 7374. Edith King.	H. R. 9444. Augustus B. Tickner.
H. R. 7376. John F. Newman.	H. R. 9449. Thomas J. Holman.
H. R. 7514. Joseph Smolinski.	H. R. 9450. Jacob W. Cline.
H. R. 7610. Baxter Hamilton.	H. R. 9454. John M. Fox.
H. R. 7625. Mary Lydick.	H. R. 9548. Nicholas Long.
H. R. 7660. Andrew Emmert.	H. R. 9554. Squire Grisson.
H. R. 7673. Daniel Bubb.	H. R. 9617. Baty Cecil.
H. R. 7675. Charles H. Ellis.	H. R. 9623. Erastus A. Kelly.
H. R. 7712. Robert Kepner.	H. R. 9709. Eugene L. Haughton.
H. R. 7748. Mary J. Titus.	H. R. 9718. Hiram J. Pitsenbarger.
H. R. 7757. David W. Farington.	H. R. 9720. John M. Willoughby.
H. R. 7786. Hamilton B. Pate.	H. R. 9723. Morris Springfield.
H. R. 7792. Sylvester C. Loveless.	H. R. 9724. Henry D. Combs.
H. R. 7813. William E. Hanigan.	H. R. 9827. Martha Wilson.
H. R. 7826. Thomas J. Lamar.	H. R. 9835. John M. Thorn.
H. R. 7837. William Himes.	H. R. 9991. James Collins.
H. R. 7854. Peter S. Huffman.	H. R. 9992. Lemuel Jones.
H. R. 7856. George W. Moore.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAINEY in the chair). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HELVERING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on pension legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. Reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. MADDEN. Let the gentleman state on what subject he expects to extend his remarks.

Mr. HELVERING. I stated that it was on pension legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to discuss politics?

Mr. HELVERING. Not at all.

Mr. LANGLEY. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

#### ENLISTED MEN DISCHARGED TO ACCEPT COMMISSIONS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9903) to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send the bill up to the desk and the Clerk will report it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman indicate the calendar number?

Mr. DENT. I will in a moment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9903) to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. GILLET. Let the whole bill be read. It is very short.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the Clerk indicate what the calendar number is?

The SPEAKER. It is No. 129 on the Union Calendar.

The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9903) to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any enlisted man of the Army of the United States who has heretofore been, or shall hereafter be, discharged to accept a commission in any component part of the Army of the United States, and who shall tender himself for enlistment within three months after the termination of his commissioned service, shall, subject to such examination for enlistment as is provided by law or regulation, be accepted and be restored to the grade held by him before being discharged to accept such commission; and in computing service for retirement and continuous-service pay he shall be credited with all time served with the forces of the United States, and his service shall be deemed continuous, notwithstanding the interruption thereof by the changes of status provided for herein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think some explanation should be given by the chairman of the committee as to the purpose of this bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, at the last session of Congress a bill was passed which provided that an enlisted man in the Regular Army who accepted a commission in the National Guard could be reenlisted or restored to his position as an enlisted man after his temporary commission expired. This bill is intended to extend the provisions of that act so as to include any enlisted man who may take a commission in the National Army. There are men who have served for many years in the Army and have noncommissioned positions now such as sergeants and corporals. They do not wish to take a commission in any branch of the service if their length of service as an enlisted man in the Army should be impaired thereby.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENT. Certainly.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman's bill also include those who are commissioned from the Regular Army, noncommissioned officers, and who desire to resign before the war is over?

Mr. DENT. The bill provides that they may be reenlisted in the Army and get the benefit of continuous service.

Mr. DYER. How long does the gentleman's bill state after the war is over they have to do that if they desire?

Mr. DENT. They have three months.

Mr. DYER. I know a number of noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army who have been commissioned in the National Army. It was called to my attention, for instance, some weeks ago that two men were commissioned—one as a lieutenant and one as a captain—and they stated to the commanding general there they desired to resign their commissions and return to their noncommissioned positions in the Regular Army, and they wanted to do it now.

Mr. DENT. There is nothing in this bill that will prevent that.

Mr. DYER. This will permit him to do it at this time?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. CRAGO. Is not the purpose of this bill to enable men of the Regular Army, corporals and sergeants, who accepted commissions in the National Guard organization for service on the border to be reinstated to their positions in the ranks of the Regular Army?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Was not that taken care of in the appropriation act of last year?

Mr. DENT. That was taken care of, and this extends the same idea.

Mr. MADDEN. This gives them the right to go back to their former status, then, any time within three months after they surrender their commissions for any cause—that is, if it is an honorable cause?

Mr. DENT. They do not lose any right by reason of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That any enlisted man of the Army of the United States who has heretofore been, or shall hereafter be, discharged to accept a commission in any component part of the Army of the United States, and who shall tender himself for enlistment within three months after the termination of his commissioned service, shall, subject to such examination for enlistment as is provided by law or regulation, be accepted and be restored to the grade held by him before being discharged to accept such commission; and in computing service for retirement and continuous-service pay he shall be credited with all time served with the forces of the United States, and his service shall be deemed continuous, notwithstanding the interruption thereof by the changes of status provided for herein.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DENT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

#### CONDEMNATION OF LAND FOR NITRATE PURPOSES.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8409) for condemnation of land for nitrate purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 8409, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8409) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the condemnation proceedings of land for military purposes," approved July 2, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill may be read.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I think we can save time. I shall object to its consideration at the present time.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman is going to object, that ends it. Has the gentleman from Alabama another bill?

#### APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS OF PHILIPPINE SCOUTS, ETC.

Mr. DENT. I have. I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill H. R. 9571, a bill providing for the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers of the Philippine Militia.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9571) to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk had better read the whole bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That officers of the Philippine Scouts be, and they hereby are, made eligible to appointment as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces in the Philippine Islands which have been or shall hereafter be drafted into the service of the United States;

and any such officer of the Philippine Scouts so appointed as an officer in said drafted forces shall not thereby vacate his commission in the Philippine Scouts, and in case his commission in said Philippine Scouts shall terminate while holding a commission in said drafted forces as aforesaid, he shall thereupon be eligible to reappointment as an officer of said Philippine Scouts notwithstanding his retention of a commission in said drafted forces.

Sec. 2. That in computing period of service for any purpose officers of the Philippine Scouts shall be credited with all time served as commissioned officers in the drafted forces mentioned in section 1 of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a brief statement from the gentleman in charge of the bill in regard to the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the House recently passed a bill authorizing the President to call into Federal service the Philippine Scouts and the Philippine Militia. At the time that that bill passed the House it was generally supposed—in fact, it was known by the War Department—that they would use these American officers of the Philippine Scouts in this new organization, but the Judge Advocate General ruled that the officers of the Philippine Scouts would not be eligible for appointment to office in the Philippine Militia, and this is done in order to correct the law and extend the provisions of the bill we have already passed.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman explain to the House the effect of the provision in the bill found on lines 8 and 9, to the effect that "an officer in said drafted forces shall not thereby"—that is, by his acceptance of the new commission—"vacate his position in the Philippine Scouts"?

Mr. DENT. I think that is perfectly plain.

Mr. MONDELL. Does that mean that there is for the time being a vacancy among the officers of the Philippine Scouts?

Mr. DENT. I so understand it. In other words, it is proposed to use this organization for war purposes, and then, when the war is over, of course the Philippine Scouts organization will be retained for peace purposes.

Mr. MONDELL. Has the effect of the legislation referred to been temporarily to disband, or will its effect be to temporarily disband, the Philippine Scouts?

Mr. DENT. I think so.

Mr. MONDELL. I assumed that was the case.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Then I do not clearly understand the necessity of the officer retaining a commission in the Philippine Scouts.

Mr. DENT. Because when the war is over he will revert to his original commission as an officer of the Philippine Scouts. The organization will be temporarily disbanded during the war, for war purposes.

Mr. MONDELL. Of course, he would be eligible for a commission in the Philippine Scouts organization in that event, so that I do not quite understand the necessity of retaining the Philippine commission. In other words, it is the case of a man holding two commissions at the same time. That is what it really amounts to.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think its analogy is to be found now in the practice whereby an officer of the Regular Establishment will vacate that office temporarily, perhaps, to hold a higher grade and rank in the National Army, and at the conclusion of his tour of duty in the National Army will revert to his old status in the Regular Army.

Mr. MONDELL. Such an officer in that event does not retain his commission.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Of course he does, but he does not act under it. He holds his old place in the lineal list, his old grade and rank, unless under the automatic operation of the law he is advanced in numbers on the lineal list.

Mr. ALEXANDER. But he does not get pay under both.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; not under both commissions.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand that in such a case the officer's place was held open for him.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. He does not operate under that commission. A man may be put in temporarily to occupy a vacancy caused by his temporary advancement, but the man's old status in the Regular organization is preserved to him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DENT. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Do I understand now that an officer in the Philippine Scouts who is drafted can not be commissioned as an officer in the Army?

Mr. DENT. Certainly he can be commissioned.

Mr. MONDELL. If he were drafted; but he can not be drafted?

Mr. DENT. No; he can not be drafted.

Mr. CANNON. I thought this was a proposal to take in the whole organization.

Mr. DENT. It does propose to take in the organization. We have already passed that bill. It is behind us. That has already been done. The question now is whether or not the Philippine Scout officers shall be eligible to appointment in this militia that we have called into the service.

Mr. CANNON. The Philippine Scouts having been drafted along with the whole shooting match he is not an officer—he is not an officer at all, not a commissioned officer?

Mr. DENT. No; he is not.

Mr. CANNON. And can not be under the law?

Mr. DENT. No; he can not be under the law.

Mr. CANNON. Is he eligible to appointment? Suppose the President should send his nomination to the Senate. Is he eligible to be an officer?

Mr. DENT. A Philippine Scout officer?

Mr. CANNON. No; an officer in the Regular Army. These people go into the Regular Army, do they not?

Mr. DENT. I really do not understand the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a second?

Mr. DENT. No. I would like to understand the position of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. What is the status of a Philippine Scout company or regiment that has been conscripted? What is the status of a man who was an officer in the Philippine Scouts? Is he now a private?

Mr. DENT. He occupies the status of a noncommissioned officer or private in the Regular Army.

Mr. CANNON. Then he loses his commission in the Philippine Scouts?

Mr. DENT. He does, or would but for the provisions of this bill. This bill takes care of that and protects it.

Mr. CANNON. Does it take care of it while he is in the Army, while the war lasts?

Mr. DENT. It provides that they may get back their commissions when the war ends.

Mr. CANNON. In the meantime he is not eligible for a commission?

Mr. DENT. Not in this organization unless this bill passes.

Mr. CANNON. I think there are officers in the Philippine Scouts who are perhaps Filipinos or half castes or Anglo-Saxons. Is that correct?

Mr. DENT. I think so.

Mr. CANNON. None of those, as I understand the gentleman, are eligible to appointment or commissions as officers in the Army?

Mr. MONDELL. Why not?

Mr. CANNON. I am seeking to find out. I am asking for information.

Mr. DENT. If you mean an appointment of the Filipino in the Regular Army, no. If he is an American citizen, he is eligible to appointment, provided he can stand the examination. A number of them have been tried out, and a number have been appointed, as I am informed.

Mr. CANNON. That answers my question.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the purpose of this is not primarily to make these men eligible to appointment in the new organization. They are now eligible to such appointment, are they not?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The purpose of this legislation is to allow these officers to accept commissions in the new organization and retain at the same time the commissions in the old organization?

Mr. DENT. That is true, but to hold and only to exercise one of the commissions that they have.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman said in the beginning of his remarks that the purpose of it was to make it possible for these men to accept commissions in the new organization. That is not an accurate statement of the situation.

Mr. DENT. It is an accurate statement of the situation, because the new organization that I was referring to is the organization of the Philippine Militia and the Philippine Scouts, to be used during the war.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; but these men are eligible to commissions in that organization.

Mr. DENT. The judge advocate says not.

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman a moment ago to say that they were. They are citizens of the United States, are they not?

Mr. DENT. I said that any Philippine Scout officer who is an American citizen is eligible to appointment as an officer in the Regular Establishment, and the War Department has given these men an opportunity to stand an examination for that purpose, and a number of them have been appointed; but they are not eligible to appointment in this new organization combining the Philippine Militia and the Philippine Scouts, to be used during the war.

Mr. MONDELL. Why not?

Mr. DENT. Because the Judge Advocate General says so.

Mr. MONDELL. That is, the Judge Advocate General has said that they are not eligible for appointment in the new organization while retaining their commissions in the old.

Mr. DENT. Substantially that.

Mr. MONDELL. That is a very different proposition. I do not know that I have any objection to the legislation, but I think we ought clearly to understand its purpose; and its purpose is not to give these men an opportunity to accept commissions in the new organization, for they can do that in any event by resigning from the scouts, but to give them an opportunity to accept commissions in the new organization and retain commissions in the old.

Mr. DENT. I think I have stated that officers of the scouts can not under the ruling of the Judge Advocate General accept a commission in the organization of the scouts and Philippine Militia recently called into service under a bill passed at this session for that purpose. This bill is intended to correct this defect in that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

#### ARMY CHAPLAINS.

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2917) authorizing the appointment of chaplains in the Army, one for each 1,200 men.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman that, while I am not opposed to this bill, at the same time, if it is going to take as great a length of time as was taken by the preceding bill, I shall feel constrained to object, because I wish to begin the consideration of the legislative bill.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. DYER. As far as I can find out, I am sure that there is no disposition to take time on this bill, and I think it very important. There is a great demand for it, and I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] will give me his assurance that if it is going to take any very great length of time he will withdraw his request, I shall not object.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill, and if any opposition develops I will withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ROBBINS. Reserving the right to object, let the bill be read.

Mr. COX. I am going to demand the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. COX. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not the mere demand for the regular order under the precedents of the House equivalent to an objection?

The SPEAKER. No; it has not been construed that way.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the Speaker will pardon me, it has been construed that way—

The SPEAKER. Ordinarily that would be the case, but in the matter of getting consent for the consideration of bills the Chair is going to construe it the other way. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. For the time being, if we can not have the bill reported, I shall be constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can have the bill reported. The Clerk will read it.

The Clerk read the bill (S. 2917) to amend section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the

Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 15 of the act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved May 12, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 15. Chaplains: The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, chaplains in the Army at the rate of not to exceed, including chaplains now in the service, 1 for each 1,200 officers and men in all branches of the Military Establishment, with rank, pay, and allowances as now authorized by law: *Provided*, That there shall be assigned at least one chaplain for each regiment of Cavalry, Infantry, Field Artillery, and Engineers."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this bill would provoke some discussion, and I ask the gentleman from Alabama to withdraw it.

Mr. DENT. I made the promise that if there was opposition to it I would withdraw my request; but I would like to make this statement first, that this is recommended by Gen. Pershing himself in a special cablegram to the War Department, and the Secretary of War has urged the passage of this bill. With that statement, in view of the objection I will withdraw my request.

Mr. DYER. There is great demand in the country for the passage of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. For the time being, I object.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES, FORMER COLVILLE INDIAN RESERVATION, WASH.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table S. J. Res. 92, providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries within the former Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to extend for a period of one year the time for the payment of any annual installment due, or hereafter to become due, on the purchase price for lands sold under the act of Congress approved March 22, 1906 (34 Stats., p. 80), entitled "An act to authorize the sale and disposition of surplus or unallotted lands of the diminished Colville Indian Reservation, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes," and any payment so extended may annually thereafter be extended for a period of one year in the same manner: *Provided*, That the last payment and all other payments must be made within a period not exceeding one year after the last payment becomes due, by the terms of the act under which the entry was made: *Provided further*, That any and all payments must be made when due, unless the entryman applies for an extension and pays interest for one year in advance at 4 per cent per annum upon the amount due as herein provided, and patent shall be withheld until full and final payment of the purchase price is made in accordance with the provisions hereof: *And provided further*, That failure to make any payment that may be due, unless the same be extended, or to make any extended payment at or before the time to which such payment has been extended, as herein provided, shall forfeit the entry, and the same shall be canceled, and any and all payments theretofore made shall be forfeited.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the gentleman intends, if consent is given, to offer some amendments, so as to grant this privilege to these homesteaders merely for one year and no longer, and also to increase the rate of interest from 4 per cent to 5 per cent.

Mr. DILL. Yes; I will say that a similar bill is on the Union Calendar, reported by the Committee on the Public Lands, which contains these changes that the gentleman suggests, and if he will offer the amendments, I shall have no objection to them. I have not prepared the amendments. The gentleman can offer them, or if he will give them to me I will offer them.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DILL. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I understand that there is some legislation on behalf of the men engaged in military service who have made entries, extending their time and giving them some measure of relief. Why should this relief be extended indiscriminately?

Mr. DILL. This applies only to homesteaders who went on the Colville Reservation last year; probably only about 500 purchased land at the appraised value. It is dry land, and last year was a very dry year anyhow. Anybody who knows anything about the conditions there knows that the first year on dry land they have great difficulty in raising crops, and last year they scarcely got their seed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Where is this land?

Mr. DILL. It is in eastern Washington, in the dry section between the Cascades and the Rockies. This will mean that these homesteaders can remain on the homestead and pay interest on the deferred payments to the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. This only extends the time?

Mr. DILL. It extends the time of payment one year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill in its present form would extend the time to one year and would grant the entryman the right to have it continued indefinitely until one year after the last payment upon merely paying interest of 4 per cent. I understand the gentleman will offer amendments to grant it for one year only on a payment of interest at 5 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. This raises the rate of interest from 4 to 5 per cent?

Mr. STAFFORD. The House bill carried a rate of 5 per cent and the Senate bill a rate of 4 per cent. The customary rate in extensions of this character is 5 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. The regular rate that they pay on deferred payments is 5 per cent?

Mr. DILL. Five per cent.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the rate of the annual payment?

Mr. DILL. It depends on the appraisement of the tract upon which the man enters.

Mr. MONDELL. What is the average?

Mr. DILL. I am not sure about the average, but not a large amount.

Mr. MONDELL. Payment per annum?

Mr. DILL. Yes; but I am not certain about the amount.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How many deferred payments are there?

Mr. DILL. This year's payments are due—probably three or four hundred of them, at the most. There will be other payments due next year. They can postpone those for one year. It simply permits the homesteader to postpone each of his payments one year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It extends the time of making the payments one year?

Mr. DILL. Yes; and he pays interest of 5 per cent to the Indians for the use of the money. These Indians have a large sum in the Treasury and are not in need of the money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "of" insert the words "not longer than"; page 1, lines 11, 12, and 13, strike out the words "and any payment so extended may annually thereafter be extended for a period of one year in the same manner"; page 2, line 2, strike out the word "last"; page 2, line 6, strike out the word "four" and insert the word "five"; page 2, lines 11, 12, and 13, strike out the words "or to make any extended payment at or before the time to which such payment has been extended."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DILL, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The House bill (H. R. 5673) of similar tenor was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 10358, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, pending that I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] whether we can not agree on time for general debate?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is now nearly 2 o'clock. I have requests from a number of gentlemen on this side amounting to more than three hours. I would suggest to the gentleman that no limit of time be placed on general debate to-day, but that we go into Committee of the Whole and have the time equally divided between the gentleman and myself and see what the condition will be at the conclusion of to-day's session.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman think we can close general debate to-day?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not if all the gentlemen on this side demand their time. It will be impossible, but some gentlemen might not claim the time.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be equally divided, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee, pending his motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, asks unanimous consent that one half of the time for general debate be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

sin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the other half by himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion of Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk reported the bill by title.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill which provides for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, carries a much larger sum than has ever been carried heretofore in a bill of this character. It is not necessary for me to say that this fact grows out of the greatly increased appropriations that have become necessary for clerks and other purposes in the departments here in Washington on account of the pending war, and if Members will examine the report submitted by the committee they will find that the great proportion of the increase in this bill over the current law is largely in two or three of the departments of the Government which are more intimately charged with the carrying on of the war. I refer to the War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, and the Bureau of Standards in the Department of Commerce. The estimates upon which this bill is based call for \$75,694,852.09. The bill as reported to the House actually carries \$69,533,598.25, or \$6,161,253.84 less than the estimates submitted by the various departments. The appropriations made for the current year for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses amount to \$55,951,799.17, or \$13,581,799.08 less than the amount carried in this bill. The pending bill provides for 17,878 specific salaries, or 1,216 more than are carried for the present year, and 1,105 less than asked for in the estimates.

Unless it is particularly desired at this time, I shall not undertake to discuss the various items in the bill and the various cuts which have been made by the committee in the estimates, preferring to leave discussion of those particular matters until the bill is taken up in due course of consideration under the five-minute rule. But I will say that the Committee on Appropriations believe confidently that there has been no cut made in any of the estimates submitted to the committee and to Congress which will result in detriment to the Government. The committee feels confident that it has provided every dollar necessary for the efficient administration of the Government and provided every sum which will be required for the use of these departments, at least for the greater portion of the year. Certainly, every sum has been provided which can now be anticipated. I do not mean to say that there is not a possibility that in the future some of the departments, to wit, the War Department and the Navy Department, may not require an additional sum for clerical assistance if the war should continue indefinitely. It has been impossible for the heads of those departments and the heads of the various bureaus in those departments to state with any degree of certainty exactly how much clerical assistance they will need during the coming fiscal year, and especially so far in advance. Gentlemen will remember that there is no past experience to guide them and to serve as a criterion for the future. It is evident, however, to anyone who will read the hearings on this bill that it carries a sufficient amount of money to carry those departments possibly for the entire fiscal year, and certainly well into the fiscal year, and if this war should continue and the necessity should become apparent during the next fiscal year for additional money, Congress will be in session in December, and the heads of these departments will then be able to go before the committee and Congress and explain with greater certainty exactly what they will need.

I may say that the committee has allowed every dollar that was asked for in the estimates submitted by the War Department. We have not cut the original estimates submitted by the War Department one single cent. I believe that it is better to appropriate many dollars more than may be needed in this crisis than to fail to appropriate one dollar necessary to the running of the Government during this crisis, if by so doing it would result in either prolonging the war or in a failure to bring about a favorable and successful peace, and the permanent establishment of those principles of freedom and democracy for which we are contending. The country expects Congress to appropriate every dollar that is absolutely necessary for the prompt winning of the war, and it likewise expects the executive departments to spend the money so appropriated wisely and

economically, and it will hold both Congress and the executive departments strictly to account for the proper exercise of the functions vested in them. The committee has held long and extended hearings, covering a period of nearly two months. As I have stated, it has been a human impossibility for the committee to determine just how much will be needed in some departments during the fiscal year, but I repeat that we have allowed every sum which we thought and believed from the hearings to be necessary. It is the duty of Congress, of course, to keep close track of these appropriations, immense as they are, which are being made from time to time. The Committee on Appropriations is not charged with the especial duty of investigating how money has been expended, nevertheless in its investigations and its hearings to determine how much money will be needed in the future it never fails to examine particularly how the money carried in a particular bill has been expended during the past.

Mr. SNOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SNOOK. Has the gentleman any information or any figures as to how large an extent the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance is being extended? How many clerks have they there now?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The Bureau of War-Risk Insurance at the present time, or nearly a month ago, had about 1,780 clerks in round numbers. This bill carries an appropriation which will authorize an organization consisting of about 2,900 clerks, and I may say that the deficiency bill which was passed some weeks ago by the House carries a similar appropriation for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. SNOOK. At how much cost for the year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Three million five hundred and ninety-one thousand dollars.

Mr. SNOOK. That is not the total estimated expense of that bureau for the year, is it?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is not the total estimated expense for that bureau for the next fiscal year. I will say to the gentleman that that bureau's estimated expense was \$3,897,848.

Mr. SNOOK. It costs a little less than \$4,000,000 a year?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The committee has allowed \$3,591,000, and I may say that the committee went very fully into the organization of the War-Risk Insurance Bureau and allowed them for salaries alone the sum of \$3,000,000.

The cuts are principally in the matter of rent, stationery, and contingent expenses.

Mr. SNOOK. It will take something like 2,900 clerks when fully organized?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. Now, Mr. Chairman, while the Committee on Appropriations have always conducted exhaustive hearings, not only as to the requirements of the Government in the future but as to the manner of expenditures of those sums which have been recommended in the first instance by the Appropriations Committee to the House, nevertheless there is a distinct duty and a great public service which the committees on expenditures of this House can render. I know of no more valuable service that can be rendered by any committee of this House than by the committees on expenditures in the departments at this particular time, especially since we are appropriating money no longer in the millions but in the billions. This bill does not carry at this time any general increase of salaries for the clerks, but I may say that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is now conducting hearings and considering an amendment, which will probably be offered to this bill before it is finally passed, making provision for some general increase in the compensation of clerks. The bill increases very few salaries of the larger class. There is but little legislation in this bill. It does carry a provision which places the Members' clerks upon the roll and provides that they shall be paid directly out of the Treasury rather than under the present custom. It further carries a provision, in accordance with the report made by the Bureau of Efficiency, discontinuing the nine Subtreasuries six months after the war ends. I shall not undertake to present the reasons for that proposed legislation at this time, because I am aware when it is reached in the consideration of the bill it will come up for general discussion.

Mr. LONERGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. LONERGAN. I call the gentleman's attention to lines 25 and 26, page 20, of the bill. Now the provision is "that the employment of any clerk or clerks," referring to the clerks of Members of the House, "hereunder shall cease upon the death, resignation, removal, or termination of service of the Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner by whom they were appointed."

Did the gentleman's committee take into consideration the advisability of continuing in the service the clerks of deceased Members of the House, or those who resigned during the period, and there was a vacancy, so that the business of constituents could be taken care of during the interval?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will say to the gentleman we did not. This provision to which the gentleman has referred simply provides that clerks of Members will go upon the roll and be paid directly out of the Treasury by virtue of the appointment of the Member. Now, when a Member ceases to be a Member of this body, either by resignation, death, or otherwise, why the committee felt that the appointee holding his position upon the roll as the result of appointment should, of course, have his connection with the Government severed.

Mr. LONERGAN. Is the gentleman prepared to express an opinion as to the advisability of giving this consideration?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not really see, I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut, any material necessity for such a provision as the one to which the gentleman refers. We have no such provision now and it has been my observation that vacancies do not exist in the House for many months. Elections are usually called speedily by governors in the States where vacancies exist and the people fill those vacancies.

Mr. LONERGAN. There is a vacancy in the State of Illinois and has been for a good many months.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And that district has now no representation here either by a Member of Congress or by a clerk of a former Member, so this provision does not make any change in the existing law in so far as the holding over of clerks to Members is concerned.

Mr. LONERGAN. To whom does one write from a congressional district where there is a vacancy in the House of Representatives; to whom do we write to have public business transacted?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I know of no one to whom to write except the Senators or some Member living in an adjoining district.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In this particular instance, this State has two Congressmen at large.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. So they are well represented, as we all know, in the State of Illinois.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Upon what theory does the committee recommend the placing of clerks to Members upon the roll?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Upon this theory, I will say to my colleague from Tennessee: This money which is appropriated from year to year is appropriated not to the Member individually but for the purpose of providing clerical services for the Member. Now I for one have never been able to see why the money so provided, appropriated as it is specifically for clerical service, should be paid to the Member and charged up to him upon the books of the Government as a part of his salary rather than paid directly to the clerks. The gentleman knows that under the recent ruling of the Internal Revenue Commission on the war-tax law, which was passed last year, it is necessary for Members of Congress to report as a part of their salary the \$2,000 which is now allowed them for clerical service. Of course we have the right to deduct—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A Member takes credit.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We have the right to deduct from that sum the same amount which has been paid for clerical services. Now, I have never been able to understand why there should be any objection to placing these clerks upon the roll, subject to the will of the Member, to be removed at any time that he may desire, and to have Government checks sent direct to those clerks rather than to the Member of Congress to be indorsed by him or cashed by him and then paid over to the clerk. It is an unnecessary bother and trouble and one that personally I would be very glad to rid myself of.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Well, if the gentleman will permit, it seems to me that there is a possibility that the provision of the bill carries the implication that Members have diverted funds from the purpose for which the law provided them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Well, if there is any such implication it will have to be read in the bill by those who so construe it, because the committee has made no such implication, and it is not for that reason that they are proposing this amendment of the existing law.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Under the law as it now stands a Member must file in the Clerk's office the names of those whom he employs as clerks.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the law. I do not know whether it is strictly observed or not. I do not think it is ma-

terial as to whether or not it is observed, because I do not see any special benefit in that particular law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, the Clerk of the House calls for the names of these clerks and keeps a record of them.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Under the law each Member must file with the Clerk of the House, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] will permit, the names of those whom he pays this clerical salary.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I wish the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] would keep his feet for a moment. I think he is quite right as to the suggestion of the implication which he did not want to set out in detail. I read in one of the newspapers this morning a justification for that statement, in that the purpose of this change in the appropriation bill was said to be intended to correct certain abuses charged up to Members of Congress. Now, that is very cheap talk. But it is the kind of talk that holds in certain districts and weighs against Members of Congress. It seems to me the provision that has been written here is susceptible of very great injustice to Members of the House, in this, that some Members of the House employ one, two, three, or more clerks, and they can not pay them all \$2,000 a year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will read this provision very closely he will find ample provision has been made for just that sort of a situation. It is abundantly protected in this provision.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I question whether the gentleman gets the point. A Member may have one working for him whom he designates as his secretary, but he may have to employ one, two, three, or more, who receive, in the aggregate, \$2,000 or more, the extra amount coming out of his own pocket. There are Members here who pay much more than that for the services of a secretary. Some secretaries may be excellent executives, without the capacity to typewrite or take dictation. In such cases the employment of a stenographer or a typist is necessary. Many Members of Congress are compelled to employ at a certain season of the year a number of persons to facilitate the distribution of documents and seeds, as the gentleman perhaps is well aware, and that is all extra money out of the salary of the Congressman, unless he can keep within the \$2,000. The newspaper statements conveying the implication referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] may be very unfair to Members of the House.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Any statement which may have been published in the papers this morning or at any other time, I am sure has not emanated from any member of the Committee on Appropriations, either the full committee or the subcommittee. And I wish to assure the gentleman that the committee in recommending this provision to the House has not done so with any such idea.

Now, I hope that Members will not be unduly sensitive about some implication that may arise if we enact a provision of this kind. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has already said that in a number of the States and throughout the country, in many papers, insinuations are constantly being made. More than that, we all know that in some cases general charges have been made that some Members of Congress are not using all of this fund for the purposes for which it is appropriated. I do not subscribe to that any more than the gentleman from Pennsylvania subscribes to it. I resent it, but the gentleman will recall that last year, in another end of this Capitol there was quite a discussion in which many references were made by distinguished gentlemen representing important States in this Union, along the same general lines. The clerks of the Senators are on the roll. They are paid directly out of the Treasury. They get their checks from the Treasury, and no Senator is charged with the receipt of any money for clerk hire, nor is it considered a part of his salary, nor does he have to make a return of that amount as a part of his salary when he undertakes to make his return for income taxes.

Now why, gentlemen, in all reason and in all fairness should we object to placing our clerks upon the same plane as the clerks of the Senators and permit them to be paid out of the Treasury the sums to which they are entitled?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman that I know of one Senator who has—but, of course, it is forbidden to discuss this matter in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think we should start the discussion of it at all.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It was not my wish to discuss the matter now. I preferred to wait until we reached that provision in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I mean the discussion of the employment of clerks in any way they please at the other end of the Capitol. I will be compelled to make a point or order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will ask the gentleman if a Member of Congress ought not to have authority over his own office—authority to dismiss a clerk at will?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will read this bill, he will find specific and absolute authority is given to a Member to dismiss the clerk at will at any time in the day or month. And he will find, further, that this provision is so drawn as to permit a Member of Congress to employ a clerk one month at \$100 and permit the extra \$66.66 to accumulate for several months, if he desires, and then to put on four or five, if he should need them, at any time that he may choose, so long as their salaries do not exceed the amount allowed. In other words, it is drawn in such a way that it can not hamper any Member in the conduct of his office and the employment of clerical assistants. That is the intention of the provision, and I believe it is drawn so as to cover it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman makes a point of the difference between the appropriation for clerks in this body and appropriations for clerks in the other body. This bill provides appropriations for both sets of clerks.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Precisely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman knows perhaps of his own knowledge of Members of Congress and Members of the other body as well who employ more clerks and pay much more money for those clerks than the \$2,000 allowed.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes. I am in that class myself, and have been ever since I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have been obliged to employ more than one.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. There has been no time when I have not had two permanent clerks in my office of a high order of ability.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman ought to have the right to dismiss either of them.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; and if I thought that this provision would interfere with me in the conduct of the affairs of my office, I would not stand for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Not now. But I am quite sure that the provision will not interfere in the least.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Just for information. I confess that I have not read the bill. What would be done in a case like this, and I think that it has happened to many Members: Suppose a Member's secretary or clerk had entered the military service, had either been drafted or had enlisted. After his departure some time must necessarily elapse, perhaps, before the Member can find a suitable clerk to replace him. What will the Member do in that case, and what will become of the salary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You mean during such time he will not have the services of a clerk?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Yes. In that case, you see, considerable time might elapse before the Member could find a suitable clerk, and he might be obliged to shift from one to another. He might be obliged to employ one or two or three, or he might not be able for a time to get anybody who was satisfactory. How would you manage?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is permitted by this clause that the money that is withheld and not paid can be paid to the new clerk.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Suppose a person taken on is not competent to perform the full duties of a clerk, and is taken on temporarily. How would you manage under the provisions of the bill in a case like that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The provision recommended by the committee does not present the slightest difficulty in a situation of that sort, because it provides that the Member may place any person he pleases upon the roll as his clerk, at any salary that he desires, and whenever he desires to dispense with the services of such person all he has to do is to notify the Clerk of the House that he has done so and the name will be stricken from the roll.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But if you have to formally employ him you must formally discharge him.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman speaks of the formality as something requiring a great deal of time and

attention. A mere telephone message or a mere letter would be sufficient.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And a little backbone.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A mere message or letter to the chief clerk would serve to discharge the clerk.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. The gentleman says so, but after all he recognizes that there is difficulty in that sort of thing?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No more difficulty now than if the gentleman unfortunately at some time in the future, during the many years that he will continue to faithfully serve the people in Congress, as I hope he will—if in the future he happens to have a clerk whose services he feels it necessary to dispense with, I am sure the gentleman would promptly take proper action.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. While I have been here I have had but two clerks.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman is fortunate.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I think it will meet this condition that exists with a good many Congressmen. They employ a secretary to whom they pay, say, \$1,500 a year. Now, in order to do the work of the office during rush times they are required from time to time, sometimes for only a few days, and sometimes for perhaps two or three weeks, to have additional help. I will say that that occurs 8 or 10 times during the year. Would the provision meet such an arrangement as that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Precisely; and it is drawn exactly to meet just that condition of affairs. I will say to the gentleman that under this provision a Member does not have to employ even one clerk for any particular month in the year. If he feels that during a certain month he can dispense with clerical service, he can do so, and the sum which has been appropriated for that particular month will accumulate, and if in the next month he needs to take it up by the employment of an additional number of clerks he can do so. In other words, there is no limitation, so far as the number is concerned, in the number of clerks he can employ or when he shall employ them, the only limitation which does obtain being that the total amount paid in a year shall not exceed \$2,000.

Mr. TOWNER. Let me see if I understand the gentleman. We will say that a Member has a permanent clerk. He goes on all the time. Of course, that is easily arranged. That would be the secretary, probably. Now, a Member wants to employ additional help or two or three additional employees in his office. He would be required, would he not, to send over a statement that these persons were to be employed and were to be placed upon the list, upon the roll, and then they would be required to make out a statement of what was paid to them, and if the total did not exceed \$2,000 they would be allowed that? Is that right?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the total amount did not exceed \$2,000 for the entire year, he would be allowed that. But it is proper to state that a Member under this provision would not be permitted to anticipate the expenditure of the \$2,000. In other words, he could not spend during six months, say, more than \$1,000 for clerical help.

Mr. TOWNER. I understand that; but the idea would be, as I understand it, according to the provision, that every time you employ a temporary clerk or assistant in the office you would have to send over the name, and they would have to receive their pay—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Through the Clerk of the House.

Mr. TOWNER. Through the Clerk of the House.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to reply to the gentleman from Iowa. I heard the gentleman from Tennessee a few moments ago state that if a Member dispensed with his clerk for 30 days the money that would have been paid to that clerk would accumulate to the credit of the Member and could later be paid to some other clerk for additional services. I do not understand that provision in that way, and do not read it in that way. The provision reads:

That each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner may appoint for such periods and at such rates of compensation as he shall determine within the said sum of \$2,000 a clerk or clerks, who shall be subject to be removed at the will of the person by whom they are appointed, but no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall authorize an expenditure from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year.

Now, if a Member dispenses with his clerk altogether during the month of January, I do not understand that he can pay a double portion in February, because that would be a greater proportion than the month of February bears to the entire year.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the gentleman's interpretation is correct. It would seem to be true, then, that if in any particular

month you employed additional help, if the total amounted to more than \$166, it could not be paid.

Mr. BORLAND. I think that is true. I raised that question in the committee—that a man would not be entitled to spend \$200 or \$250 during the month of March and then recoup out of a later month.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is true. You can not recoup out of a later month; but I think it very clear from this provision that if there was any surplus left over from a preceding month the Member would be entitled to expend it for clerical services.

Mr. TOWNER. Then I will ask the gentleman if this would not be the case: For instance, you pay your secretary \$125 a month, and that leaves a very small amount, comparatively speaking, between that and \$166, the maximum allowance. Then, for instance, during the season when he is sending out seeds, or matters of that kind, he could not have very much help to assist him, because all he could expend would be the difference between \$125 and \$166. That would be true under the provisions of the bill, would it not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That would be true if he had theretofore expended the full amount of clerk-hire allowance for the months which had passed.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that, because he could not recoup from any preceding month more than the amount that would be required to make up the \$166.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

Mr. TOWNER. I am only seeking for information. The gentleman from Missouri seems to understand it as I have stated it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I differ both with the gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Missouri on that proposition. It was the intention to draw this provision so as to allow for just that degree of latitude. If it is not altogether clear on that point, or there is any ambiguity, it can be amended, and we would be glad to have such an amendment proposed by those who find difficulty with its present form.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman point out what provision would permit a Member to expend the \$2,000 in the last six months of any fiscal year if he failed to expend for clerk hire in the first six months of any fiscal year \$1,000?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It is this provision in lines 8 to 17, on page 20.

Mr. NORTON. I am following the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It provides—

That each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner may appoint, for such periods and at such rates of compensation as he shall determine within the said sum of \$2,000, a clerk or clerks who shall be subject to be removed at the will of the person by whom they are appointed.

Mr. NORTON. But that is modified.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It says—

But no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall authorize an expenditure from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year.

Now, that seems to be perfectly clear. In other words, if four months have elapsed, one-third of the year, then the total amount for clerk hire which would have accrued up to that time would be one-third of \$2,000, or \$666.66. Now, it says specifically that no Member shall authorize an expenditure from said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire year.

Mr. NORTON. That is just what I want to clear up. Six months are one-half of a fiscal year. Then according to that provision during the last six months the Member would not be permitted to expend more than one-half, the proportionate amount of \$2,000. Is not that right? He could not expend more than half of \$2,000 during the last six months.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It would depend on how much he had previously expended.

Mr. NORTON. If he had not spent anything?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If nine months have elapsed the Member would be entitled to spend for actual clerical services three-fourths of the \$2,000, but he could not exceed that amount.

Mr. NORTON. Three-fourths?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because he could not anticipate the amount of the future allowance.

Mr. NORTON. I think the gentleman is not correct. It says—

But no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall authorize an expenditure from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Take the month of October, which is the tenth month in the year. This bill provides that no Member shall authorize an expenditure—

from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year.

Now, taking October as your month, the preceding portion of the year is three-fourths of the entire year.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Ending with September.

Mr. NORTON. Three-fourths of the calendar year.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, this says that the Members shall not be permitted to—

authorize an expenditure from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year.

It seems to me, gentlemen—I may be mistaken about it—that there is no difficulty in construing that provision.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman has not already explained, I wish he would tell us where under this part of the bill the Member is permitted to have any part of the \$2,000 accumulate at all. If the period means anything, it would probably mean a month. If it means a month, a man could not spend any more than \$166.66 in any one month, regardless of how little he had spent in the preceding month.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. During the first month, under the clear provisions of this bill, a Member would not be permitted to expend more than one-twelfth of \$2,000, but during the second month the proportion of the fiscal year would be one-sixth.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. POU. Is not the purpose of the bill to require the Member to pay it out monthly as it accumulates?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Precisely, if that is his desire.

Mr. POU. One month is one-twelfth of the fiscal year, and he can pay out during that month \$166.66. When the next month comes along he can pay out \$166.66.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. POU. And he could not do any more than that.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman has been stating that the period of time referred to in the bill would evidently mean a month. I would like to know why it means a month when you say "any period" of time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It does not mean a month necessarily.

Mr. KEARNS. It says "any period of the fiscal year."

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes; a Member can discharge his clerk at any time.

Mr. KEARNS. And in any one day you can not expend more than \$5.33.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. A Member can not do more than that now.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman said he could employ additional help. If your secretary gets \$1,500 a year, he would have \$500 to his credit; and suppose there is a day you want to employ two or three additional clerks.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The gentleman knows that when he draws the monthly pay for clerk hire he is required to certify that he has actually expended the sum of \$166.66. I submit that if any Member is following the policy of drawing \$166.66 and withholding it for one month or six months, then he is not acting in conformity to the certification he is required to make in order to draw the allowance.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman is not applying his remarks to me.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, no.

Mr. KEARNS. For I never have seen a salary check since I have been a Member of Congress. My secretary signs my name to the check and gets the money and, of course, keeps it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not understand why there should be so much criticism and protest by Members who employ more assistance one month than they do in others.

Mr. KEARNS. I do, and pay it out of my own pocket.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. The solemn certification that Members make when they draw \$166.66 is that they have actually expended it during that month.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I believe everything the gentleman has said about the salary, but what I want to know is this: The Member

is entitled under the bill to \$5.33 a day, and no more. If a Member has a clerk employed at \$1,500, he would have \$500 to his credit each year, but suppose he wanted to hire three or four girls and pay them \$2 or \$3 a day. Under this bill you are estopped from paying more than \$5.33 a day. Your clerk gets \$1,500, or about \$4 a day. If you want three girls in the office and pay each one \$3, that would be \$13, but you could not pay them out of the other \$500 remaining to your credit, because you are estopped from paying out more than \$5.33 in one day.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Under the certification Members of Congress are required to make in order to actually draw this money monthly, does the gentleman think any Member has a right to accumulate in his own pocket \$500 for any particular month of the year? Is not he pledged and bound by the certification to have actually expended that amount of money during the month?

Mr. KEARNS. I do not think so; no.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will examine the receipts he has filed he will find that he has certified to that.

Mr. KEARNS. I tell the gentleman I never saw one; my secretary signs them and draws the money himself.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If he indorses them, he indorses them with the gentleman's assent and approval. I am referring to the receipt which the Member is required to sign.

Mr. KEARNS. In my case he gets the money, too.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not doubt that.

Mr. KEARNS. You can not spend under this provision out of the \$2,000 more than \$5.33 a day.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. You can spend \$166.66 during the entire month.

Mr. KEARNS. But I am talking about a day.

Mr. POUL. A month is the unit.

Mr. KEARNS. The bill does not say that a month is the unit. This is what the bill says:

But no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner shall authorize an expenditure from the said sum of \$2,000 proportionately greater for any period of the fiscal year than that portion of the fiscal year bears to the entire fiscal year.

A day is as much a period as a month, or one-thirtieth as much. There is nothing in the bill here which says that a month shall be the unit, for it says "any period."

Mr. WALSH. They do not get a check every day.

Mr. KEARNS. And a day is a period the same as a month would be a period and—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is no quorum present.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I hope the gentleman will not make that point.

Mr. WALSH. I will withdraw the point of order, but I would like to hear something that is going on.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to say this to the House, that I have no objection—

Mr. WALSH. One would think this was the only item in the bill.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee (continuing). I have no objection in the world to answering questions that may be propounded to me with reference to this section, but I would infinitely prefer that we defer this argument until it is actually reached in the consideration of the bill, because undoubtedly it will provoke argument at the time.

Mr. KEARNS. I was asking in all earnestness; I wanted to get the information.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I was very glad to give the gentleman what information I could.

Mr. KEARNS. The gentleman has been very kind.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I believe it is a universal practice among Members to have their seed franks and speeches addressed by the piece, at so much per thousand. How would you be able to apply any part of this allowance to that expense?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not know how he would be able to apply it, unless he sent in the names to the Clerk.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. How could he send in the names when he does not know what he is going to pay until after the work is done?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He may then send it in, and it would be paid.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Their names must go on at the time he sends them in, and then they are dropped at the close of the job, and he only settles after they finish the job.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. He could send the names in to meet that sort of objection, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama, and indicate what sums he wanted paid to them at

the conclusion of their labors. I do not think that presents the slightest difficulty. He could put their names on at any time if they had actually rendered clerical service.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I would ask the gentleman how could he indicate it when the work has not been done and it is paid for by the piece?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Because the Clerk of the House would have no right to pay any sum to any person employed by any Member unless the Member designated the amount to be paid.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. In advance?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Not necessarily in advance.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. But when the name is put on the roll it must be designated as the salary of the employee.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Not necessarily at all.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I do not see how otherwise.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. As I understand the gentleman, without reference to what has been done in the past, but after the passage of this bill and it goes into effect, if any Member pays for the first month any sum in excess of the monthly allowance that sum will be gone, he can never recoup it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Why, certainly, if this sum is paid in advance.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If he should pay \$200 the first six months—

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Precisely, because under this provision the money for clerical help would be paid to the person actually performing the services.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Why, certainly.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If the Member paid any sum out of his own pocket in any one month, why, of course, there would be no way of recouping it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, during the session a great many of us employ more than we do at other times. I have two in my office at present, whom I am paying an amount in excess of the monthly allowance. Now, if a man should do that in the first part of the year, then, as I understand the bill, it would be lost; but if he in the first part of the year should pay less than the sum, then, in the later part of the year he could pay enough more to make up the total amount of \$2,000.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If he needed the clerical services; that is the way I construe the provision.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It seems to me the bill ought to be amended so as to equalize that.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Now, I will say to the gentleman that this provision would make legal just the sort of practice that a number of Members have presented here this afternoon, because, I wish to repeat, the check that is issued to each Member every month for his clerical help is issued on a receipt which bears the express certification that the same has been actually expended for clerical help, and the Member who indorses so certifies to his Government; and that is the only way that he can draw his clerical hire month by month.

Mr. SUMNERS rose.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If this provision is adopted it makes it perfectly legal for a Member, if he needs a \$100 clerk in January and he needs two clerks at \$100 in February, he to be the best judge of that, to make that employment legally by simply sending their names over to the Clerk of the House and having the sum paid directly to them. I want to say this—I will yield to the gentleman from Texas in a moment, if he will permit me—gentlemen will recall that last year an unpleasant incident happened because another distinguished body in another end of this Capitol undertook to provide legislation of this kind, not guarded as this is, but simply a provision placing clerks to Members upon the roll just as their clerks are being paid out of the Treasury.

The amendment adopted by that body came to this House, and a number of Members upon the floor of the House criticized it and opposed it, not on the ground that they were opposing the amendment as a matter of principle, but on the ground that there was an unwarranted interference by another body with this House in the administration of its own affairs. The committee has proposed this provision, with the view of giving to the House an opportunity to express itself on this particular proposition. If a majority of the House does not want to accept it, well and good, but we at least ought to have an honest and a fair expression upon this subject, because I happen to know, from statements made to me by many Members, that there are a great many Members of this House who have been clamoring for just this sort of legislation for years.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS. I just want to ask the gentleman this question: In view of the fact that there is not the same degree of uniformity of work in this body that is imposed upon the Members of the Senate, does not the gentleman think there ought to be a greater latitude in regard to the period of time in which this \$2,000 may be expended by Members of the House?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And there is.

Mr. SUMNERS. So that in those periods of the year when we send out bulletin lists, or get out our garden seed, and do those things in months that are unusual in regard to the amount of work and in regard to the amount of expenditure, we ought to be permitted to make application at that time?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And if the gentleman who, I know, is a good lawyer studies this provision, and then studies the law authorizing the payment of clerical help to-day, and the manner in which it is paid, I am more than convinced that the gentleman will come to the conclusion that the provision recommended by the committee in this bill does give a much wider latitude just for that very purpose than you have under the present existing law, because it does not require a Member to actually certify that he has expended that much money during the month in order to get it. The money is paid directly to the clerk.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman from Tennessee not think that it would be quite an inconvenience to Members to have secretaries, two or three, or paying three or four people here for work and none probably at home? At home one would have to do his work by piece, and sometimes pay out in a month a hundred dollars or two hundred dollars. What is the point of this proposition?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. This provision would not interfere with that sort of situation in the least.

Mr. MOON. Suppose, for instance, a Member has only \$50 worth of work done last month, but may have to have \$250 worth of work done this month. Does it interfere with that?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. It does not interfere if the amount is not proportionately greater than the period of the year bears to the entire fiscal year.

Mr. MOON. What is the reason for having any proportions about it? Is it the idea that Congressmen can not be trusted to pay this out?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Not at all.

Mr. MOON. What is the use of tying it up?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. And I want to ask the gentleman what is the objection to placing the clerks of the Members of the House upon the roll—

Mr. MOON. I have got none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Rather than charging it to the Member?

Mr. MOON. I do not care if he is put upon the rolls. It does not make any difference about that. It is going to be an inconvenience to the Member to put him on the roll unless the secretary can be with him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I want to take about 15 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed an hour.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. But the time was equally divided between the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself.

Mr. MOON. I shall not ask the gentleman anything further about it. This is new legislation entirely, is it not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I do not concede that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MOON. I will show the gentleman how to concede it when it comes to the point of order.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. We will thrash that out at the proper time. Just briefly I want to refer to one other point, and that is that no one can thoroughly consider the method and the policy of the Government in paying the salaries of clerks and employees without coming to the conclusion that there is an utter lack of system and lack of uniformity in the present method.

It develops frequently that clerks in departments—clerks, if you please, at the same desk, performing exactly similar services—receive different amounts, which of course is manifestly unfair, inequitable, and unjust. There ought to be, in the interest of fairness not only to the clerks but to the Government, and in the interest of good and efficient administration, a reclassification of the salaries paid by the Government, and I hope that the time will come when Congress will take this matter up seriously and either through a joint committee, appointed from both Houses, or by an interdepartmental commission, conduct an investigation and enact such legislation as will secure

uniformity and system in the payment of the employees of the Government, guaranteeing to each clerk that he will receive fair and honest wage for a fair and honest day's work.

I am aware, of course, that this is an inopportune time, because the times are abnormal and it certainly ought not to be considered or taken up during the war. But after the war, when times become normal, I hope that some such steps will be taken.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I think I am in sympathy with what the chairman of the committee wants to do, yet I am confused by reading the language as to whether I have precisely what the chairman wants to reach. Do I understand that this provision is to prevent the expenditure of any more for any period than \$166 per month?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman refer to clerk hire?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. As I construe it, and as I attempted to say a while ago, it permits a Member to consume during the entire fiscal year the \$2,000, but it does permit a Member to have some latitude, something that he does not possess now, in distributing the \$2,000 over the fiscal year, always with the condition that he shall not spend any greater sum at any particular period than is due, or, in other words, that he shall not anticipate in the expenditure of the amount allowed for the entire fiscal year.

Mr. FESS. Now, let me put a concrete example.

There is no possibility under this provision for a Member to spend more than \$166 per month, whether he spends it in one month or in two months or three months, because if it is one month it is one-twelfth of the amount, and if it is two months it is one-sixth of the amount, and as I read it the provision is to limit the amount that can be expended, but not necessarily the minimum.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the gentleman is clearly correct. During six months he can not spend over one-half and during the three months not more than one-fourth.

Mr. FESS. If he had not expended it all it would not be possible for him to expend the balance unexpended in a different month?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think under this provision it does give that latitude, something, as I say, that does not obtain at this time.

Mr. FESS. I am not contending about it, but I do not think the language will permit it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. That is the way I construe it, and I think if the gentleman will examine it more carefully he will possibly come to the same conclusion.

Now, gentlemen, in conclusion, and pursuing the remark I made a moment ago with reference to the necessity for reclassification of salaries, I wish to say that there has grown up a condition of affairs whereby some clerks sitting at the same desk, performing exactly the same services, draw a different amount in salary. It is wrong; it is unfair to the clerks and does not make for a good and efficient administration. I think that condition has largely grown up by reason of the fact that a number of committees make appropriations for the payment of clerks' salaries, and on that account these differences have crept in and have continued to grow and magnify. I think that is one argument for the concentration of the appropriation of salaries for employees in one bill. I am aware that when a member of the Committee on Appropriations makes that suggestion he lays himself open to the charge that he is trying to secure extra jurisdiction for the committee of which he is a member. It does not matter, gentlemen, what committee makes the appropriation, but undoubtedly a condition of the kind I have described will necessarily arise when more than one committee has charge of the appropriations for the different employees of the Government and in different departments. I am aware, of course, I am frank to say, that there will not be any change in the rules in that respect; but I do believe that a commission such as I have indicated could, after a thorough and exhaustive investigation, make recommendations to Congress which would cure this evil to a certain extent, for a time or for a period of years, until our manner of making appropriations results in bringing about another disarrangement.

Now, before I close I want to refer briefly to one department of this Government which without action by Congress has undertaken to establish an efficiency rate system, and that is the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General, as you know, was long a distinguished Member of this body and a very influential member of the Committee on Appropriations, and from his investigations during his service here he came to recog-

nize this very evil of which I speak. When he became Postmaster General he called upon the Bureau of Efficiency and requested that bureau to come into the department in conjunction with a department commission that he appointed, and they rearranged and reclassified the salaries. And with what result? With the result that he has secured better and more efficient administration and at the same time, during the period that he has been Postmaster General, he has actually reduced his force 253 in number, saving sums aggregating several hundreds of thousands of dollars every year.

He has not done that at the expense of anyone or with an injustice to any employee, because he has dismissed no one. He has simply declined to fill vacancies as they occur. And to show that it has operated for the benefit of the employees as well as the Government, the records of his office show that since he became Postmaster General and reduced his force, saving the amount of money that I have stated, the average salaries of clerical help in his department have increased from \$1,240 a year to \$1,340 a year and the average salaries of the laborers in his department have increased from \$720 a year to \$776. And I hope other departments will eventually follow this plan. In the interest of good administration and fairness to all the clerks.

Mr. SNOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. SNOOK. In this connection there has been a very large number of young men detailed from different branches of the Army to act in clerical positions in different branches of the Government during the war. How are they paid? Do they receive salaries from the Army or are they carried in this appropriation?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They do not receive pay under this appropriation unless they are actually serving and performing a service called for in the appropriation bill.

Mr. SNOOK. There are many of them in the Ordnance Department and the Aviation Service in Washington, as well as in the other departments.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. When they enlist they are paid as enlisted men.

Mr. SNOOK. They are officers?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are paid as commissioned officers. They do not receive any pay under the appropriations carried in this bill.

Mr. SNOOK. Does not that have a very great tendency along the very line the gentleman is speaking about as to the salary of people working at the same desk and having somebody drawing a salary as captain and some one working opposite to him drawing a less salary?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. So far as I am informed, that condition does not exist in the departments. I know there have been made statements to the contrary, or at least I have heard them, as to the War Department, but inquiry has failed to develop that that condition really exists.

There are, of course, many additional officers now serving in the War Department, but they are not doing what may be called strictly clerical work. The clerical work is performed by civilian employees carried in this bill, with the exception of the Navy, where yeomen and landsmen are called upon to perform clerical service.

Mr. SNOOK. I am talking about men detailed from the Officers' Reserve Corps. What service do they perform if it is not clerical service?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I assume that it is something of a supervisory nature with reference to carrying on the war.

Mr. SNOOK. You understand they do not do any clerical work at all?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. My understanding is that they do not do any clerical work whatsoever.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. On page 18 of this bill there are three or four special messengers and employees under resolutions which are mentioned as of certain dates. What do these employees do? They are under the Doorkeeper's department. On page 18, for instance, there is an assistant department messenger and others in a resolution of December 7, 1897.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I can not give the gentleman the names of those employees, because I do not know them. They were authorized, as the gentleman knows, by resolution of the House, and are performing the services for which they were originally appointed.

Mr. WALSH. That is, it is presumed they are.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I think the presumption is not a very violent one; I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state in what part of the bill and under what title the barbers in the House Office Building are carried?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They are carried as laborers.

Mr. WALSH. Do they perform any other labor beside barbering?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They do.

Mr. WALSH. In the House Office Building?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Oh, in the House Office Building—I am frank to say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the status of the barbers in the House Office Building. I thought the gentleman was referring to the barbers in the Capitol Building.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to refer to the ones in the House Office Building.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. If they are carried on this roll they are required to do a certain amount of cleaning up by the Doorkeeper, because they are under his supervision, and during the recess of the House they stay here and perform the general work of a laborer.

Mr. WALSH. It would not be amiss to require them to clean up the barber shop, to keep that clean; but if their principal labor is that of barbers, why are they not called barbers in the bill?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For the simple reason that Congress does not undertake to provide for barbers. If they were carried as barbers they would be expected to shave Members free.

Mr. WALSH. If they are not barbers, why are they permitted to carry on the work of barbers?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I suggest that there may be two answers to that. All their time may not be required in performing the work required of them as laborers. I am informed that the barbers here in the Capitol perform work in the early morning and in the evening cleaning up certain corridors of the Capitol and certain rooms.

Mr. WALSH. They are paid \$600 a year to put in a couple of hours' work a day, are they?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. They have certain rooms and corridors to look after, for which they are responsible.

Mr. WALSH. For which they are paid?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. For which they are paid \$600 a year.

Mr. WALSH. And the rest of the work they perform is merely a gratuity on their part to such Members as may desire to avail of their services?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I assume that the reason the custom has grown up to permit them to conduct the barber shop during the day is for the convenience of Members, because I apprehend it would be very difficult to secure barbers to come to the Capitol and open a shop, depending entirely or altogether upon the somewhat limited custom of the Members here.

Mr. WALSH. And yet there is such a shop in the Capitol, is there not?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. I am not aware of that fact. Now, gentlemen, I have detained you much longer than I anticipated.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Very well.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman spoke about the efficiency of the Post Office Department. Did the gentleman intend to include in his remarks the Railway Mail Service, for instance?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; my remarks were confined altogether to the department clerks here in the District of Columbia. I had no reference whatever to the postal employees in the field. That is a matter which does not come within the jurisdiction of this bill, and I have no information concerning it.

I want to thank the gentlemen of the committee for their patience. I will reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, had agreed to the conference asked by the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. POMERENE, and Mr. TOWNSEND as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee resumed its session.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the committee on the question of the need of farm labor, a subject that has been much talked of, and properly so, but which I think is becoming acute, as judged from the vicinity where I live and the letters which come from that community.

Mr. MADDEN. Before the gentleman enters upon the discussion of the question, I would like to make a suggestion to him.

Mr. FESS. I will be glad to have the suggestion.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it might be illuminating to what the gentleman has to say upon that question. All over the United States men who have been prosperous farmers have moved from the farm into the village and have no employment, and they are now whiling away the autumn of their lives in ease and comfort. Why would it not be a good idea to discuss the advisability of having those men who are experienced farmers go back and take another "rip" at it during the war?

Mr. BORLAND. Including possibly the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I would be perfectly willing; and I may say to the gentleman from Ohio while I am making this suggestion that I have already asked the Secretary of Labor in a written communication whether he has any statistics showing the number of men of the class I have suggested who might be utilized in the development of the farm and the raising of the food supply of the Nation while they are not within the years that enable them to fight in the ranks.

Mr. FESS. When my friend first offered the query I thought there was a degree of levity in it.

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. FESS. But I admit that there is not, and it is a legitimate question. And as I now recall some of the localities that I know, I am sure there are a good many of what we call retired farmers that have come off the farm and now live in the little village, fed by the farm; and, as I now recall, a good many of them direct farms of their own through their tenants that they have upon the farm. Just how much loss of labor to the farm that element would make is, I think, a matter of legitimate investigation either for the Department of Labor or for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MADDEN. The amount of loss would depend on the age of the men who are on the farm and may be drafted.

Mr. FESS. If I may be permitted to give an opinion without knowing exactly the facts, I am rather of the opinion that a large proportion of those people have not only gone away beyond the draft age but really beyond the effective age on the farm for heavy work.

That would be my opinion from personal information. But I could not offer that as comprehensive. Really, members of the committee, this is a critical question, becoming more so with the months. I hesitate to offer any letters I have received, because it is so common to receive letters of complaint that a letter of complaint need not be regarded as conclusive of a situation. But these letters are nearly all of the same tenor, and I am quite certain that they are not in a spirit of faultfinding, although some of them are based upon lack of information. For example, I have three or four letters which openly charge that there has been unfair discrimination in the operation of the draft law as administered through our local boards, in refusing exemptions to farmer boys when they claim that exemptions had been allowed to city boys. Now, I do not believe that there is any real foundation for that statement.

I can see how a farming community would miss a boy who has been a good farmer and who they think ought to be exempted, if he is taken, and a refusal to exempt him would probably intensify the feeling more than the refusal to exempt somebody in a city, where there are so many people that the going would not be so much missed or so noticeable as it would be in a farming community. One of my farmer friends insisted that 90 per cent of the farmer boys who were called were taken, and that very few of them were exempted, while a great number of city boys were exempted. I made the statement to him that he was most likely confusing the idea of exemption with the idea of rejection for defects, and that I thought—although my statement was denied by some Member on the floor the other day—that there were more persons accepted from the farm because of freedom from physical defects than there were from the cities. When I made that statement some one here

said that the figures proved otherwise. So that while I think that is true, without a doubt, in my immediate county, it may not be true taken as a general proposition. Therefore I can not speak definitely on that point as a nation-wide statement. I see a good many Members shake their heads, indicating that they do not agree with my statement.

Mr. WALDOW. I understand Gen. Crowder made a statement showing that you are wrong.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman give that as an opinion or as a matter of information?

Mr. WALDOW. As a matter of information.

Mr. FESS. That Gen. Crowder has made the statement that the rejections on account of physical or mental defects are not greater in the city than country?

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that Gen. Crowder has a record of all the exemptions, from every class, in every congressional district in the United States, and can furnish detailed, accurate information as to the causes for the exemptions in every congressional district, if Members want to apply for it.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman make the statement that he says there are fewer rejections from the city than from the country?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know; but I know that very few exemptions have been made from my own territory except for physical defects, or because of the fact that they were not citizens, or that they had family obligations that exempted them as a matter of right.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman from Illinois will understand that my statement was that I thought there were not more exemptions in the city, but that there probably were more rejections; but if Gen. Crowder states that there are not more rejections for physical defects from the city than from the country, I would have to revise my opinion. However, I still think that rejections from the city are more numerous than from the country, otherwise our much-vaunted open-air advantage over the congested and badly ventilated city situation does not stand for much, in fact. It is a favorite theme of most of us that we would much prefer to bring up our families in the open country, and health was ever the one desideratum.

Mr. CRAGO. Gen. Crowder divides the physical defects into the urban and the rural, and he says there is a slight difference in favor of the urban—that is, that the percentage of rejections on account of physical defects is slightly less in the city than in the country, but the difference is very slight.

Mr. FESS. As an individual with a good deal of pride in having my statements accurate, I thank the Members for the statements they have made, if made on authority, because if that is true that the health of the city boy is better than that of the country lad, I think it is a very remarkable fact, and I repeat much of our much-boasted country life must be discounted.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. In the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are some very interesting figures in a letter from Gen. Crowder to Congressman McKeown, of Oklahoma, on that subject. If the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. FESS. I would be very glad to have them at this very time, that an authoritative statement on the point may go to the country in connection with this discussion.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. He says:

Statistics to be found in the report of the Provost Marshal General to the Secretary of War, dated December 20, 1917, disclose that in 1917, 13,843,578 persons comprised the field of labor appurtenant to agriculture. Of this number only 205,731, or 1.48 per cent, of the entire field were determined by the boards to be liable to call for military service, and less than .0074 per cent of the labor supply appurtenant to agriculture was actually withdrawn therefrom by the first draft. The effect of that draft is thus shown to have been relatively insignificant, and the conclusion that the shortage in that labor supply is attributable in any substantial degree to the draft is thus shown in a most striking and conclusive way to be erroneous.

Mr. FESS. That statement goes to the question of proportion of farm laborers taken in proportion to other occupations. That does not cover the question I offered as in explanation of the charge that farmers' boys were refused exemption, while city boys were granted it, in which I suggested that these people were confusing exemption with rejection, which would indicate no unfavorable discrimination against the farmer.

However, I do not understand the force of the general's statement that the idea that any large proportion of the agricultural source of labor had been taken is an erroneous idea; because certainly there has been a very large proportion in my own vicinity that has been taken, to the extent that it has worked great harm in my immediate community, which is a very striking agricultural section. What I was trying to urge, how-

ever, is that I do not believe there is any basis for the statement that there has been any discrimination in favor of the city as against the country boys in the operation of the draft. I do not think there has been, but I know there is a suspicion in the country that the charge is true. I think it ought to be cleared up here, because such suspicion creates a bad state of public opinion wherever it exists. I thought the explanation of so many more boys going from the country than from the city in our community was that it was due to rejections instead of exemptions in the city. But we will pass that, with the hope that the real facts may be so clearly set forth by the department that all suspicion may be removed from every community.

Mr. Chairman, agriculture is facing a crisis this spring, due not so much, if at all, to the operation of the draft, but rather by way of comparison with other activities of the war. In my own community, for example, the Wilbur Wright Aviation Field was built during the summer, and not far from my home the Camp Sherman cantonment was built. Both took much of the summer. The war activities, of which the construction of these Government buildings was but a part, stripped our entire community of its labor. This came right in the midst of corn cultivation and a little before the harvest time. It of course ran through the summer and totally absorbed our labor throughout the busiest months of the farm, including harvest time, when to save the farm crop labor had to be secured. The situation in my immediate community was acute. It appeared for a while that the year's work was in certain jeopardy. This, of course, was not due to the draft, but to war preparation.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The demand for labor was so great and the prices so high that the men went from the farms to accept other employment.

Mr. FESS. That is what I mean. My whole community was totally stripped of labor that theretofore had been dependable for farm work. They went into these cantonments to get large wages and to work where there were a great group of men. The inducements held out by the Government were persuasive not only as a patriotic service but the high wages offered were unlike anything that community had ever experienced.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to these Government activities, recognizing as I do that it had to be done and that additional prices had to be held out in order to induce the farm laborer to leave the farm at a time when the farmer could not afford to lose him. To all protests the reply, of course legitimate, was that this work must be done and that it must be done now; that in order to get it done the Government will have to take from work that is permanent the laborer and place him at temporary labor, and to do that much higher prices than is paid where the labor is permanent, and especially rural, must be paid. Consequently when the Wilbur Wright field got into full swing all the farm labor in our country went. The same thing was true in building the cantonments. I am speaking now of Ohio in my particular section.

If you had gone through the southern and southwestern parts of Ohio in the months of October, November, and December, you would have seen this year what you never have seen before—field after field of corn, some standing on the stalk uncut and others standing in the shock unhusked. Many of the fields were not put in wheat that ordinarily would have been put in wheat. And when you asked why the corn remained unharvested the quick reply comes, "All of our help is gone. We have not the help to husk and put the corn in the crib." And then you ask the question why it is not fed in the shock to live stock, and the reply comes at once, "Well, we have had a very good price for live stock and it has been sold, and what we have left we can not afford to keep for feeding because we have not the help to feed it."

Mr. OVERMYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. OVERMYER. At the close of the gentleman's remarks I expect to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a letter from Provost Marshal Gen. Crowder on the question of exemption of farm labor, and in that letter he gives some interesting figures.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] has just read those figures into the Record.

Mr. OVERMYER. I thought they were of sufficient interest to be put in the Record.

Mr. FESS. Now, whatever be the cause of the loss of labor to the farmer, that is no longer important except as it may be corrected. The fact remains that he has not the labor. The question at once comes before us, How are we going to assure the country that the food supply of next year is not going to be kept up with the past production but most certainly not increased? It can not be unless we find the labor for it. There

is no use to mince words, the vast acreage of America means nothing unless cultivated, and cultivation depends almost wholly upon farm help.

Mr. ALMON. The conditions of governmental activities will be different in 1918 from what they were in 1917 as to the construction of cantonments?

Mr. FESS. The construction of cantonments, it is true, will be less if not entirely completed, but in the shipbuilding plants and in the munition plants, the real war activities, it will not be true. There is a city not far from the home of my colleague, Mr. OVERMYER, that is the center of war activities for munition making. Although it is 150 miles from my home, it has attracted many men from my own town. It is war work. That is pretty general over Ohio. So I will say to my friend from Alabama that I can not believe that we have a great hope from the letting up of war activity, so that we can be assured that this labor will come back to the farm. Both the war demands and the abnormal prices paid are against such hope.

Some suggestion has been made that we take the labor out of the loafing places. I have a series of letters, all running in the same line, asking why we do not go to the towns and take out of the saloons and the loafing places those people who would be vastly better off if they were put on a farm and made to work. Probably the same reason such worthless human jetsam would not qualify for the Army would make them wholly undesirable in a respectable farmer's home. Another suggestion is that we go to the city employment bureau, and there find the labor that has been rejected by the draft on the ground of defects or for other reasons have not been called, and take them to the farm.

Now, I am very sensitive myself about making any statements that would be resented by our city dwellers. I have lived in the city and I have lived on a farm. Since I have reached my majority I have lived in the city, including five years in the second city in size in the United States. I fairly know the city, and I know the farm as it used to be, before modern methods came in vogue in scientific farming. I know the customs and habits of the farmer in his home and what he must do and what he expects others to do. I know about their getting up in the morning and about their regularity for meals and about their going to bed at night.

If you will allow me, I will say that it was my pleasure to work on a farm up to the time that I became a citizen of 21 years of age. I have been on farms where the farmer expected me to retire to rest by at least 8.30 o'clock, and in the summer time that is a little after sundown. While that seems to the city dweller incredible, yet had he worked in the field as I have worked he would be glad to find his rest at early dusk. I have been out in the field, my friends, a mile or more from the house and barn, with the horses plowing corn before the sun was up, and that was in the summer time when the sun rose early. That meant up in the morning before the break of day, even before the birds were astir, in order to feed, curry, and harness the horses, feed the other stock, and then take breakfast by lamplight. I was under the regulations of a high-grade farmer, and I want to say now that those were among my happiest and most healthful days. If you would take a city boy out on the farm like that where he hates the night because it is so dark, and longs to stay in the city because it is light, where he hates the country because it is so lonely and quiet and he wants the city because it is so social and gay, you can not get him to bed at night and you can not get him up in the morning. These farmers who know the business of farming simply will not be bothered with that sort of interference, and that is all there is to it. I know whereof I speak. They would prefer to do what they can themselves and leave the balance undone. The average farmer guards carefully his live stock, and especially is careful in the handling of his horses. He will positively refuse to allow every Tom, Dick, and Harry handle his horses.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Certainly I will yield to my much-respected colleague, Gen. SHERWOOD.

Mr. SHERWOOD. By what authority could we take bums and compel them to work on the farm?

Mr. FESS. My colleague presents a pertinent inquiry and shows by it, although himself a resident of a city, he knows and appreciates the demands of the farm, and discerns keenly the futility of the suggestion that farm labor can be cared for by the bums or saloon loafers. He especially appreciates the matter of handling stock, as no man in the country knows more than he about horses and the importance of proper treatment not only of fine roadsters but great draft and farm horses as well.

The same can be said of the care of fine-bred stock of every character on the farm. To suggest that this is the business of loafers is little short of an insult to the farmer of to-day.

I beg the pardon of my colleague. I was going to answer why we did not take these persons from this or that place when I got into this particular line of thought, and I would not change my answer, because what is true of the city lad would be true of what these people call the loafers in places where they are not working. A farmer would not stand for that thing.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. I take it, then, that the gentleman feels that the farmer does not do business on a seven-hour basis?

Mr. FESS. My friend is so obsessed with that particular contention that he often tries to embarrass gentlemen—

Mr. BORLAND. I should regret exceedingly to embarrass the gentleman. Nothing is further from my thought.

Mr. FESS. There is no embarrassment to me, I would assure my friend from Missouri. I have never been embarrassed by hours of labor.

Mr. BORLAND. I thought the gentleman was discussing labor and the cause of the shortage. I may have misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman is not going to get anywhere by this sort of publicity; it does not mean anything. The farm situation I do not think can be materially relieved by taking these people from the city. It might be relieved in a degree if there was a wise selection, because we do know that in the city there are numbers of people who are inclined to rural work and who would really work with a heart upon the farm, but you would have to exercise wise selection in order to make it effective.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to suggest that a city laborer is wholly unfit to work on the farm; that it takes as much experience and skill to make a farmer as to make a mechanic.

Mr. FESS. I know that.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. It is nonsense to talk about sending the men to the farm for a season or for a limited period. It is a business that has to be followed during a long life.

Mr. FESS. I admit that, and I think I could state without hesitation or danger of being embarrassed for stating it that it takes more skill to-day to be a real, successful, scientific farmer than it does to be a very successful lawyer or a success in any of the liberal professions which for years have been the ambition of our promising youth, and the preparation for which meant years of training.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Or a Member of Congress.

Mr. FESS. Oh, yes; or a Member of Congress. The farmer has to know the chemistry of the soil, which alone is a world of investigation in itself; he has to know the current of prices to know what to emphasize this year and what the next; he has to be a political economist, so as to know the lines of production; he has to reconcile production with consumption, and to say that all that a farmer needs is the ability to drive two horses and hold a plow handle is simply silly.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet is it not a fact that the champion cotton pickers of the land come from the cities during the cotton-picking season, who never worked anywhere else except in the cities except during the cotton-picking season?

Mr. FESS. I would ask my friend from Texas, admitting that I do not know about that, is the cotton picker that comes from the city selected or does he come in a promiscuous group?

Mr. BLANTON. They wait for the cotton-picking season to come and leave their places as cooks and mechanics and laborers in the city and go to the cotton fields.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. As I understand, the people to whom the gentleman from Texas refers are colored people from the cities.

Mr. BLANTON. Colored and white. Some of the champion pickers are white.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Colored people are naturally cotton pickers.

Mr. FESS. Is there any particular skill required in cotton picking?

Mr. BLANTON. We draw from the cities in every department of the farm during the harvest season, during the harvesting of oats and the wheat—

Mr. FESS. The gentleman does not answer my question. Is there any particular skill required in cotton picking?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly there is. I dare say there is not a Member of Congress here, who has not picked cotton, who could pick 100 pounds in a day if he tried; and yet there are men who pick 500 pounds in a day.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Is it not a fact that these city people that the gentleman from Texas speaks of are really people who learned to pick cotton in the country before they moved to the city?

Mr. BLANTON. That is largely true.

Mr. FESS. That would be perfectly safe. Of course, there are any number of people in the city who have lived on the farm, whose training was received on the farm, and who could profitably be returned to the farm.

Mr. BLANTON. The point I was trying to make is that in every farming section dependence is placed upon the labor from the city during the harvesting period.

Mr. FESS. That may be true of some sections, but not of every section. I know that it is not true of my section of the country. Our people are scientific farmers, and, by the way, are the most independent of all our citizens.

There is another phase of this labor problem that I am going to mention, and I do not do it with any offense to anyone or any group of our people. The farmer frets terribly under the exactions of union or organized labor. The purpose of organized labor is to better conditions of the laboring class of our citizenship, a perfectly legitimate ambition, indorsed by the country; to increase wages; to shorten hours; to insure better conditions under which labor is performed. These humanitarian movements, which are always the result of groupings of people, which especially will be noticed in factory life or wherever congestion of population obtains, are entirely wanting, as everyone knows, on the farm. Consequently, if you take some one who has been identified with union labor and put him out on the farm you can see precisely what would happen.

Now, let me read a paragraph or so from one of my correspondents, and this correspondence is simply spontaneous; it has not been the result of any inquiry made by me. These are letters which incidentally come to me about the farming situation. He says, in regard to the farm-labor question:

I was recently told by a friend what his experience was during the last threshing season. He helped out a job of thrashing on a farm owned by a city man. The owner of the farm brought some help from the city. The farmers that went to help paid no attention to the time of day in commencing work. The town fellows, however, would not begin until a certain time and they would not allow the others to work, either. There you have a sample of organized union labor on the farm. They not only refused to work until they got ready, but they refused to allow anyone else to work. Some of them are not worth much even during working hours or anything except smoking cigarettes and filthy talk. I do not believe I exaggerate when I say that such help is a curse on the farm.

Now, while that statement may be a little overdrawn and it may come from a person who has had an unfortunate experience, yet we all know that such exactions can not be fruitful of good results on the farm and men inclined to demand such observances are a real detriment on the farm, which can not for a moment depend on such labor.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. If the gentleman will wait a minute, I beg the gentleman's pardon—yet there is some basis for my correspondent's feeling. He is not accustomed to this sort of thing out on the farm. Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the gentleman realize what would happen to a man down in the country in which I live who would try to start something like that on the farm?

Mr. FESS. I do not. There is another suggestion that has some currency, and that is the organization of the boys and girls who are now in school to take them out in the months, say, of April and June. Many of these schools—high schools, like our famous township high schools throughout the country in most of the States—have an attendance that comes largely from the farm, many of them from the little villages. They know the farm. Now, I think in an emergency like these war times, when food is the slogan, while I believe thoroughly in conserving the time in the schools for our boys and girls, yet I believe that in this stress that policy ought to be tried; that there ought to be a unified effort throughout the country, and it ought to be through cooperation with school authorities, to let the boys and girls go out on the farms, to be free certain months in the year; and while we have no authority, of course, I would like to see the school authorities give credit for the work they do on the farm, so that this work need not necessarily prolong the school age. I mean to allow this work on the farm to count for that which otherwise they would have to do in the schoolroom. In other words, I would not want to prolong the school period as a punishment because they had gone out to do this helpful work. I believe that that can be done, and it would be wonderfully fruitful for this reason. All

of you know about the corn clubs and the United States agricultural clubs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I have been interrupted so much.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. FESS. Fifteen minutes, if you can allow it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield the gentleman from Ohio 15 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 15 additional minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying; he is making a very profound discussion of a subject in which the entire country is interested. I know he has given some thought to the subject of furloughing some of the farmer boys who are in the Army for the gathering of the crops this summer. What has the gentleman to say on that subject?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend that I am going to take that up in due time. The facts are that these observations are now being made in order that I may present the identical phase of farm help suggested by the question. The movement, as I was discussing when the question was asked, in the organization of corn clubs and the household economic clubs, by offering certain prizes to the boy for the greatest yield of a given character, or to the girl who gets the best results in kitchen or otherwise, whatever the prizes are offered for, has proven to us beyond a doubt that farm ability can be wonderfully enhanced by encouraging general movements of interest among the young people on the farms and in the villages where they know the farm, and I believe that is something that ought to be taken up at once as an emergency measure, both as a State and National movement. I understand that in New York there is an organization of the girls by some woman's movement. I saw a statement here in Washington where there is such a movement on the part of a woman's organization. Such a movement is now in vogue in my own district, where local organizations reaching from city to country are attempting to enlist all the people in a campaign of production. All of these will have helpful results, I am sure. Then there is another phase along that same line. However, I do not want to take that up at this particular juncture.

With reference to getting the labor from the Army camps, I will now address myself to what I think is a feasible and workable proposal. There will be, everyone will note, some inconvenience, even if we pass such a law, and there will also be some striking disappointments, because if we pass such a law, which I hope we will, and it ought to be passed soon if it is passed, the farmer will expect his own son to come to his farm.

Now, of course, we can not assure him of that. He would naturally rather work his boy, who is acquainted with the farm and the teams and all that goes with that particular farm, than to have some other soldier and give him a home for the time being, and while that ought to be done in the degree that it is possible to do it, you can see at once that it is bound to work a very great disappointment in various communities, and I have been trying to keep our people informed about that, that they must not expect their own son in every case to be returned. But there ought to be a relief, and I think there can be, from this particular method. Here is a letter that indicates a possible disappointment:

I would like to be furloughed for the reason that I shall now state. As father has a farm now rented of 208 acres, which is located—

I do not want to identify this boy, because he is writing me from his camp, is now in service as a military boy, and it might work him some inconvenience. He continues:

My father is unable to get the help to run the farm. He has out now 80 acres of wheat; he is going to put out the same amount of corn in the spring. If I get out and help him, as I have been the main support of him, he will be able to have this work done. Father has 12 head of horses, 15 head of cattle, 75 head of sheep, 35 head of hogs that he can not give proper attention. He has not been able to get any help all winter, and he has not got the last year's corn crop out yet. He can not get anybody to help take care of the farm, and I think I can farm and do it better and with better results than any hand that he can secure. Father is 65 years old and is unable to do any kind of work in the field. Father has not done any work for the last six years. He has been depending on me to do the work. I have tried to indicate here briefly some of the reasons why I should be furloughed.

Now, you read this letter, and between the lines you have a suspicion that the boy is not entirely happy in the Army and would like to get out. However, what he says would make a strong case for exemption; but if it is impossible to exempt him—and that can not be since I have presented the case to the War Department, which refused exemption, since he is already in the service—but if it is possible, for him to be given a period

whereby he could go back on the farm and work for a specific period, it would be a great benefit not only to him but to his community. He would probably be rendering a greater service to his country by so doing than to remain in the military service.

That letter is one of a great many in the same line. The only trouble is you can not discriminate where a boy wants to work the farm from a desire to get out of the Army. We have got to recognize that in the passage of any bill that we enact here.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Is it the gentleman's idea that the former boys in the Army ought to be permitted to go home and make the crops?

Mr. FESS. My idea is that there ought to be a quota permitted to go home at certain periods of the year and assist on the farm. I would not say all the farmers should do that. That, of course, would be impracticable.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. My constituency is a farming constituency, and I was just wondering what would become of the Army if they were to demobilize it to this extent.

Mr. FESS. The Army is not composed wholly of boys that come from the farms to start with, and not all the boys that come from the farms ought to be furloughed, especially at any one time. Nothing can be done to disorganize the plans of the military service. My point is that there is a positive need for farm labor, and we have got to meet it, and I do not know where you can get more effective labor than to collect from time to time selective groups in the camps for turning back to the farm, and allow them to return as soon as the period elapses. I think that is important. They would be the most effective men you could possibly find in the country.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman from the Military Committee.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman will understand that possibly those men would be furloughed who belong to camps or divisions or organizations that were not immediately destined to overseas work.

Mr. FESS. Certainly. That is my meaning.

Mr. TILSON. Or, in other words, from those units from which they could be spared with the least demoralization to the Army itself?

Mr. FESS. Certainly. I would not think of interfering with the Army in its military requirements.

Mr. TILSON. So that it would be impossible to single out of these men individual men, because they might belong to the very organizations that were going overseas first.

Mr. FESS. And that is the one thing that will make the operation of it inevitably disappointing back home. That is what I meant. Of course, we would not think of emptying the camps. It is a selective method, taking what we can allow to go, where we can do it effectively during this crisis.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do you not think if that sort of an act passed or if that kind of a regulation was formed that a very large number of those in the Army would be asking for furloughs?

Mr. FESS. I am sure of it. But their going would not depend upon their wishes, but upon the selection made by the authorities.

Mr. HASTINGS. Do you not think it would have the effect of demoralizing the Army?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend that I do not think it would have such an effect. The boys in the Army are under military training, and one of the first things we learn—and I know it by not only my own experience, but by the experience of some people who are very close to me—is absolute obedience to the rules of Army life.

Mr. PLATT. In the good old times, when the schools used to educate great men, and we all know they do not do it nowadays—

Mr. FESS. I do not accept that statement as a fact.

Mr. PLATT (continuing). Boys did not go to school except in the winter, and they worked on the farm in the summer time.

Mr. FESS. I do not know whether my friend thinks that we ought to dismiss the modern schools and go back into the one-room schools or not, where you could teach 55 classes per day, as I did in my first term.

Mr. PLATT. If you will read the life of any great man in the country, you will find he went to school only in the wintertime and worked in the summer time; and that is what we ought to get back to.

Mr. FESS. I am afraid that my friend is in the class of those who consider that under the modern system nobody can spell, because they study other subjects besides the spelling book.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if he requires any more time?

Mr. FESS. If it would not embarrass the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is pressing me, but I will yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have received a number of letters from farmer constituents telling of the impossibility of conducting their respective farms because of the taking away of their help. What does the gentleman from Ohio think of the proposition to have the statute made mandatory that help essential to the carrying on of a farm shall be absolutely exempt from the draft?

Mr. FESS. I do not believe that we would dare exempt agriculturists as a class. I think it would be inequitable and undemocratic.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not as a class, not all agriculturists; but we can not exist without food, and the only people that grow the food are the farmers. Suppose, now, there are three boys on a farm; should it be optional with the board to permit all three of those to go or should one of them be exempt from the draft, where the mother is a widow and has no other help? I have exactly that case in my district.

Mr. FESS. It seems to me that such treatment would be unfair to the party in interest. The draft law as it now is written would permit one or two of those boys to be exempt, and it should be so administered.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If the gentleman will permit, it is left discretionary with the board.

Mr. FESS. Yes; I think it ought to be so left.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Should it be left discretionary with the board? Should not the public welfare, the necessities of the Government, require in such cases that the statute should be made mandatory, and that the work on the farm shall not cease in the production of food necessary for the Government?

Mr. FESS. Well, I confess it is a little confusing to me to say that you should make it mandatory simply because of the difficulty in many cases to tell whether that particular boy really ought to be kept on the farm or not, when it is a question of whether he is needed or not. I had a case like this brought to my attention and I carried it up for exemption, and the party said to me, "Why, this boy is not needed on the farm. He is in the university." I said, "Certainly; he is in the university, but he is studying agriculture in order to go back and be a trained farmer." I was astonished to be told then that he was not studying agriculture, but he was studying law. They wanted him on the farm, but they had sent him away to study law. He should not have been exempted.

I think we have got to leave a discretion somewhere, and not make the law mandatory. I certainly believe that there ought to be greater favor to agriculture shown in interpreting the law relating to exempting these people than there has been exercised.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In the case the gentleman cited there must have been somebody on the farm doing the work while the boy was absent.

Mr. FESS. His father was on the farm.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But supposing his mother was a widow. I have that kind of a case.

Mr. FESS. I think that is a case of unwisdom to refuse to exempt that party. I think there should be greater care exercised in the exemption of the agriculturists. I feel sure it will be used in the future.

Now, in reference to the furlough question, it might be of value of the committee to know that several bills have been introduced, one by the Committee on Military Affairs, and such a measure will come into the House in due time, if it can be brought in by the Committee on Military Affairs. I think that is very wise and ought to be done very soon, because in some sections of the country the time for farming is on.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Before the gentleman leaves that point, I will state that such a bill has been reported out of committee. It has either been ordered reported out or actually has been reported out.

Mr. FESS. So I understand from the chairman of the committee, with whom I talked only to-day.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Who is to use this greater latitude in the future?

Mr. FESS. Of course, it will be the appellate board.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the gentleman has in mind these local and district boards, I can say to him that I have in mind a young man who is working 70 acres of land. He has an uncle 70 years old and an aunt 75 years old. He was put into one of the low classes and went before the district board and was then put in class A. He has 70 acres of land. I do not think that that is much latitude.

Mr. FESS. When I said "latitude" I was probably misunderstood. I mean there ought to be greater favor shown in exempting the farmer boy than has been exercised hitherto.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I have several cases in mind, cases in my neighborhood, where they have farms; and they take them all without any distinction whatever, apparently.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALMON. While we are discussing the issuing of furloughs to some of the farmer boys who are already in training, at the same time we understand from the press that in all probability there will be another draft, probably about the 1st of May, right in the midst of the crop time, when other boys will be taken from the farms. What would you think of the idea of legislation to the effect that no farmer boys shall be taken into the second draft or be called until some definite time, say, the 1st of August, in order that they may aid in making this crop?

Mr. FESS. That suggestion might work considerable inconvenience in the training ability. We must not allow any of these items to stand out against the training for the war as an entirety, and if it should happen that no call is made up to a certain period, and there would be no training up to that period, I would be fearful that that might interfere with the plans of effectually prosecuting the military program, and I would hesitate to do that.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Certainly. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Does not my colleague believe that it is just as essential that we have boys on the farm to work the farms to produce the necessary foodstuffs and supplies as to have them in the Army?

Mr. FESS. Of course, we are compelled to have labor on the farm.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to a case that was brought to my mind a few days ago. It is the case of two brothers living in my district, their father and mother both being dead. They had left to them a farm, and they have worked hard to get the debts cleared off the farm. They have improved machinery and a nice stock of cattle on the farm. There are only two brothers and a sister. The draft board has called both the brothers into the service and placed them in class A. It seems to me that the Government made a serious mistake when it took those young men off the farm when we need all the agricultural help in our country that we can get to do the work.

Mr. FESS. I will say to my colleague that I think, according to his statement of the case, that is a serious situation and ought to be remedied. Surely such cases will be corrected if they are presented to proper authorities. We can not trifle with the question of food production.

Now, gentlemen of the committee, if I may be permitted to go on without interruption until my time expires, I have three or four things that I want to say to the committee connectedly, and the first is this: As to these various suggestions of securing help, another suggestion has been made to take help out of the State prisons, out of the penitentiaries. In a great many places a movement is on foot to take them out in groups, say, to work 10 or more men under one command, and take them from farm to farm. I do not know whether that would be workable at all. I do not know why it could not be, although I have not gone into it. It has already been suggested.

Another suggestion is for the State itself to aid by furnishing to certain areas tractors. Ohio is in great activity just now on that suggestion. The governor of the State has recommended it, and the State university is offering to show how it can be done. The idea is for the State to purchase outright a great number of tractors—not to loan them out, but to put them out under some skilled operator and let him go from farm to farm in the community and gather the community together—and let them, in a community way, work the farms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. FESS. I did not get to finish what I wanted to say. May I have five minutes more?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FESS. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman one or two questions after he gets through.

Mr. FESS. This asking for more time is getting to be a joke, but I did not mean it to be so. The tractor proposition, as I say, is receiving a good deal of consideration in Ohio. New York is also becoming active in this form of relief. I here insert a dispatch in to-day's paper:

The State of New York will furnish 61 tractors for service on the farms of the State this season. The plan under which these tractors may be rented and used is announced to-day by Director C. J. Huson, of the bureau of production of the New York State Food Commission.

Application for these tractors should be made direct to Director Huson at the office of the food commission, Agricultural Hall, Albany, N. Y. Every tractor must be used to plow 200 acres or more for food crops.

The plan under which these tractors may be used will make them of the greatest possible efficiency in plowing and fitting land for food production. In 1917 New York State was the pioneer in this work in the United States, having purchased and put out 42 tractors. This year the lessons learned in 1917 will be put into effect, and each tractor will be more efficient and of greater service because of what was learned last year.

#### TWENTY NEW TRACTORS.

One of these tractors may be had in any one of three ways. Under plan No. 1 an organized group of farmers, five or more; under plan No. 2 an experienced and responsible tractor operator; or under plan No. 3 an individual farmer may get one of the machines. Rules are provided for each plan.

Of the 61 machines 20 will be new (purchased this year), the other 41 those which were used last year. Each machine will be accompanied by either a two-plow or three-plow outfit, including harrow. A specified rental is to be paid the State, as follows: Secondhand two-plow outfit, \$50 to \$60 for the season; secondhand three-plow outfit, \$75; new two-plow outfit, \$75; new three-plow outfit, \$100.

The full details will be communicated to anyone interested upon request. Some of the more important details are as follows: The organization or individual signing the contract with the State must assume responsibility for the machine and pay the rental; must pay for all necessary repairs, fuel, oil, freight (within the State); and deliver the machine next fall to the nearest railroad station or properly house it for the winter. He must also guarantee to plow at least 200 acres during the season and to keep the machine in use every possible day and only for plowing and fitting land for food production, except when special permission for other use is given by the commission.

#### PLANS FOR THEIR USE.

Under plan No. 1 the group which gets the tractor must limit its use to 40 acres for each member of the group, one half of which may be done in the spring and the other half in the fall. Under plan No. 2 the operator who may get the tractor may not plow or fit more than 40 acres (20 in the spring and 20 in the fall) for any one individual. Under plan No. 3, if an individual farmer secures one of the machines, he is permitted to plow but 60 acres (one-half in the spring; one-half in the fall) for himself. Under all three plans the tractors must be kept in service as nearly constantly as weather permits. The charge for the use of the tractors is limited to \$1.25 per hour for a tractor up to 10-20 size, or \$1.50 per hour for a tractor above the 10-20 size, or if the charge is made per acre to \$3 per acre for plowing and 75 cents per acre for harrowing once over.

I have heard certain objections to the tractor proposition; that the need of labor is not so great in the planting season as it is in the harvesting season. But I think the need is about as great in the planting season, for the simple reason that in our section of the world every day is not seasonable. We have got to make hay while the sun shines. You have got to get your ground ready. Then you must get your crop in. That is one reason why we are insistent that we must have good seed, for if you plant seed that is not good, by the time you find out that the first planting is a failure the season is gone and it is too late to plant a second crop.

Mr. TILSON. Does not the gentleman think that if a man makes an almost superhuman effort to get a crop planted, and then he gets a good crop, he will make more than a superhuman effort to harvest it?

Mr. FESS. Absolutely; there is no doubt that is true.

So much for the tractor suggestion that has been discussed in Ohio and New York, if not elsewhere.

Another suggestion that I think every Member of the House ought to have in mind is that we are going to suffer from want of crops next year because of the fact that we did not have the assurance of labor, and many of our farmers have sown their farms in grass, which will not be broken up at all and will not produce the cereals. Now, it may sound strange when I state to you that a large proportion of the vicinity in which I live, which is an agricultural community of a very high grade, has done that very thing. Let me read to you from a letter that is exceedingly suggestive. This letter comes from the president of the Red Cross movement in my town, who has given up all of his time to war activities. He has 300 acres of ground, a splendid farm, with tenants on it, but they have gone, all but one, and this is what he says:

From personal observation there is a growing feeling expressed among the farmers, true at that, that the farm products depend upon the farmer; that the people can not live without the farmer and his products. This feeling can easily grow to a condition that might

become serious. Labor is his great drawback—good, competent labor. Often his help is on one part of the farm while he is working at a distance. The farmer has been overworked, tired, discouraged from the help standpoint. This leads to his giving up, selling out—

Now, listen—

or, as in my own case, I have prepared to use as much stock on pasture as possible; and if our assistant is called to the colors—and he is subject to be called—our farm will have to go on a 50 per cent capacity. Not that I want to, but am forced to make the best out of a bad condition.

That letter is written by one of the most patriotic men we have in our community, and he is working constantly for the interests of the community.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's additional five minutes have expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. He had 10 minutes, as I understood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. FESS. Out of this condition we have this certainty: There is not going to be as great a cultivation in acreage next year, if my community is at all a fair representative, and it will not be because the people are not interested in the war. It will be because they say, "We simply can not do it, and we have got to make the best of a bad situation."

Take that as one thing. Then add to that this other fact that all must admit: The corn last year did not mature, as it usually does, because of the early frost. Corn is out in the field where it has remained all winter. This was the hardest winter that any of us has gone through in reference to the keen cold. All through our country we are told that most of the corn which otherwise would make good seed corn is absolutely worthless as seed corn because of its immaturity and having been out all winter and perhaps other reasons. I had a man come into my office who is one of the best agriculturists in Ohio. He was on his way to see Secretary Houston. I gave him a letter to the Secretary in order to present that corn situation from the standpoint of seed to the Department of Agriculture here. He told me that he had taken the corn and tested it as they usually do, and that he finds section after section of the fields where the corn is perfectly useless for seed. That, I fear, is going to create a great disappointment in the yield this coming year. All through my section there are movements by county organizations attempting to select the good seed from the worthless. There is really a serious situation which is alarming the people.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I dislike to interrupt the gentleman, but there is one matter to which I should like to call his attention, as his time is drawing short.

Mr. FESS. That is all right.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman has spoken about the need to produce a crop and about the future food products of the country. I want to call the gentleman's attention to an article which appeared in a Baltimore paper, which deals with the subject of the hotels. As the gentleman knows, the hotels have changed their mode of serving meals. Whereas they formerly served a portion that could be divided between two people, now they have made them all individual portions. They charge about the same for an individual portion that they once charged for a large portion and you have no right to divide that with anyone.

I have a clipping here from a Baltimore paper, in which it is said that the hotels claim that this is not an advantage to them, but that what is left over when they serve too much for one person and will not let it be divided with anyone else goes to the waiter. The article says:

These are the property of the waiter, to give away, take home, or sell. What he does not want goes to the bus boy, the waiter's underling. It was also pointed out by the managers that the practice of serving a portion for two people existed in the days when the individual portion was called the half portion, and that it had been found advisable to refuse to serve individual portions to two people on account of the necessity of restricting patronage to the more desirable class of guests.

"There are plenty of people," said one manager, "who live in nail bedrooms and who would come in and order one portion of a single dish to divide between them. It does not pay us to encourage that class of patronage. The practice of charging an extra amount for service of a single portion to two people is also open to many abuses from the standpoint of the employees. The waiters are apt to play favorites, and it would be next to impossible to check up on them."

Of course, I think we will all agree that the reason stated by that hotel manager is a very foolish one. Does not the gentleman think the hotels of this country ought to be investigated on this question of the waste of food? They have adopted this system for the primary purpose of getting a larger price from the people, and then they serve more than one person can eat. I have particularly in mind one case where two of us went to a hotel; they served me enough for three people. Yet I was compelled to purchase the same amount for the other person, and what was left—about half—was sent into the kitchen for whatever might be done with it. It is an outrage upon the

people for the charge made by most hotels for single portions, and it is discouraging to everybody by the waste of food caused by this method of extortion.

Mr. OVERMYER. I will say to the gentleman that the Lever bill, which has been referred to our committee, will be taken up very soon. It takes up that very question, which we hope to present to the House very soon.

Mr. FESS. I am very glad to hear that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FESS. May I have three minutes more?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is so reasonable in his request for time that I certainly will yield him the three minutes and hope that he will not be interrupted.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to occupy so much time of the committee, but this is a subject that has been fugitively discussed by individual Members who have been offering observations upon it, and I felt and feel now that there is a possibility of a crisis that none of us fully comprehend.

The truth of the matter is the submarine is not out of commission. The truth of the matter is the submarine activity is on the increase. There are more ships being sunk than before, there is more food being sunk than before, and we all know that with our soldiers across the seas we are going to be on the sea more with our food. With a lessening of food in Europe, as must be inevitable, and an inevitable lessening of food in our own country from present conditions, everybody must see that here in the face of the most perfectly organized military machine the world ever saw, in the persistent effort to sink what food it can find on the seas and with those sinkings increasing, you are losing at both ends. You are not only losing in productiveness but in destructiveness. And so it is high time that we not only make every foot of our ground produce to its maximum but make everybody conserve to the very minimum. Then, as to the war-garden proposition, we got \$350,000,000 additional fruitage last year; but we want to increase it this year. We ought not to be compelled to suffer loss, as is suggested by my experience in this town when a Government clerk told me that he had a little vacant lot out here that he wanted to plant and they wanted \$8 for plowing it. That is an outrage; the Government ought to take over the vacant lots and see that they are cultivated, and if the Government does not do it the city authorities ought to do it.

I need but call attention to the city of Springfield, Ohio, where the office of the city manager undertook the war-garden work last spring. A census of the available garden plots in the city was made, and when seeds were distributed free by the city, if the person asking for seeds had no place to plant them, a lot was turned over. After finding that lots could not be gotten ready for planting on account of scarcity of teams and plows, the city employed several teams to plow and harrow the lots. When fields could not be secured by donations, the city rented them and cut them up into war-garden lots. Ordinances were passed protecting these city lots from vandalism and theft. When the crop was harvested the city established a clearing house where those having vegetables for sale could bring their product and dispose of it without the necessity of peddling it about the city.

This coming year the work will be continued. There now is being planned a systematic campaign to reach out over the county to augment the yield of the farms tributary to the city.

Mr. RANDALL. The Government ought to stop the use of 60,000,000 bushels of grain for the breweries.

Mr. FESS. I emphatically agree with that statement, and will do all in my power to stop it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman ought to know that brewery products are food. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, I have noticed in the newspapers from my district, and generally throughout Pennsylvania, that it is the intention to close not only the colleges but the public schools one month earlier this year than ordinarily for the purpose of releasing the students, that they may go upon the farms and increase the product of the land.

The result of that patriotic action will, of course, add much to the sum total of the Nation's food products. I represent a great agricultural district of Pennsylvania, including a large portion of the fertile Cumberland, Tuscarora, Kishacoquillas, Trough Creek, Path, Buffalo, and the Big Valleys. A more productive soil nowhere exists on earth, nor are there better farms anywhere; and yet in the newspapers coming from this section I find the statement that more farmers are this year offering to sell out and leave the farms than in any other period in the history of this section.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; although my time is brief.

Mr. LITTLE. How much an acre do they want for these farms?

Mr. FOCHT. They are very valuable farms. I will answer the gentleman's question more understandingly a little later. The reason they are leaving the farms is because they do not have the farm help to get the maximum of production. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] has said, they are patriotic; the farmers are all patriotic and they have done their share, but they are discouraged to the extent that many do not want to go ahead with their accustomed plans on account of the uncertainty as to help.

Now, I wish to state, without inserting in the RECORD many letters from the section of the country where these boys go from the farms, the fact that many must reduce the acreage under cultivation this year. There is one instance at least, according to a letter I have received, where a farmer was unable to get his potatoes out of the ground last year and where the corn remains to-day unhusked in the field.

There was a farmer here the other day, a patriotic man and fine citizen, whose son volunteered and is down in Texas. Inasmuch as the selective method of raising the Army does not carry into practice the early understanding that there would be exemptions in the more needful occupations, such as farming, all he asked was what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] suggested—a furlough. I give these instances in the hope that there may be worked out some method of returning to the farm, temporarily at least, on furlough during the planting season and the harvesting season some of these boys—not loafers picked up around in the cities, whom the farmers say would be more of a menace and a nuisance than a help, but these practical farmers who know the farm and who left it to go to the war. And what my farmer friend asked was not that his son should be relieved from any of his obligations as an American citizen and a patriot, but when he was willing and anxious to serve his country he wanted the boy to come home on a short furlough and help put out, then harvest the crops. In the absence of his son he is alone and his wife is an invalid, and he would be obliged to reduce the acreage; and to reduce the acreage now would be as fatal as reducing the activities in the preparation and increase in numbers of our Army and military equipment.

Therefore, representing this agricultural community, and having these specific cases brought to my attention, I am prepared to second the thought of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] in the hope that the committee, in their wisdom, may be able to work out some plan by which these farmers whose sons have left the fields to go to the Army may not be compelled under the force of necessity to curtail the productiveness of the agricultural districts. [Applause.]

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman speaks of furloughing during the planting and the harvest time?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Does the gentleman simply mean it for a few weeks?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes; if nothing better can be done, a few weeks, not in excess of a month, since it seems they are not to be exempted entirely.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not know anything about the farming conditions in Pennsylvania, but I do know that in Iowa they need about the same amount of help from March until October, because one kind of work follows another. It is planting and then more planting and cultivation and the harvest and the thrashing and in the fall there is the husking of the corn.

Mr. FOCHT. Exactly.

Mr. RAMSEYER. And a few weeks' furlough, if it is in planting time in the spring and a few weeks in the harvest, would not solve the problem with us.

Mr. FOCHT. It would in some measure. Of course the farmer himself would have to be helpful there; but, as for hay and wheat and oats, there is an interval between harvesting these and the harvesting of corn, during which they might go back to the Army. Those are the principal crops of the country I represent. It would differ, to be sure, according to climatic conditions, but it could be adjusted so far as the greater portion of Pennsylvania is concerned.

Mr. RAMSEYER. In a country where they have small grain, like the Dakotas, I can see where a few weeks in planting

and in harvest time and at thrashing time would be of very great help.

Mr. FOCHT. That would have to be worked out by the intelligence and the wisdom of the agencies in charge of the program.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not yet given me the price of that land.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. In due time the gentleman will have an opportunity to vote for a bill which will permit the Secretary of War to furlough men for a shorter or longer period, as it may be determined is best toward winning the war.

Mr. FOCHT. I consider that a wise provision. I would like to have time enough to answer the gentleman from Kansas, who says he desires to know the value of the land in the seventeenth Pennsylvania district.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman said that they had the finest farm land in the world and were anxious to sell.

Mr. FOCHT. No; not anxious to sell the land, but some farmers desire to quit because they would be compelled to reduce acreage.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman said he never saw so many who wanted to sell their farms.

Mr. FOCHT. They are mostly tenants advertising stock and equipment because of the labor conditions that exist.

Mr. LITTLE. I want to get the price.

Mr. FOCHT. I assume that the more land there is on the market the lower the price would be, and that price, of course, would be measured according to the quality of the land, buildings, and so forth. In my section land sells anywhere from \$50 to \$250 per acre.

Mr. LITTLE. That would be my theory.

Mr. FOCHT. That would follow as a matter of common business practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I will ask that the gentleman be yielded one minute more.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman what effect he thinks price fixing has had on the farmers of our country? In other words, the Government has fixed the price at which he must sell his products, when the price of labor is out of sight.

Mr. FOCHT. I will answer, in a general way, that I regard all of the fixing of prices and the attempts to break down the law of supply and demand and the evident fuel regulatory fiasco as necessarily demoralizing and discouraging. Particularly is the arbitrary price fixed for wheat far from commensurate and below adjustment with other commodities and supplies the farmer must buy in the open market. In considering the high wages now paid labor we must not overlook the fact that the purchasing power of a dollar is only half what it was in 1914; hence the increase of wages for labor is the only method by which adjustment to meet high prices of commodities can be accommodated. My answer might be more amply embodied in a few remarks I made on the floor months ago, when the food-control bill was under discussion, and which presumably was to increase the food supply and bring down the then soaring prices. I quote from my observations of prophecy as contained in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 3, 1917, and also an editorial from the Chambersburg Repository, as follows:

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I simply desire to say that I have grave doubts as to the efficiency of this measure. I doubt that it will accomplish any good results. In the presence of the multitudinous agencies that are now in force to regulate everything and everybody in this country I doubt very seriously whether any single individual is big enough to extend himself with any effect over this great Western Hemisphere, or, in fact, over the whole world, which, according to the provisions of this bill, he will have the authority to supervise. However, this authority has been sought by the Chief Executive and by the majority party in power, and, inasmuch as they have sought it and are to assume the responsibility for it, I am willing that it shall be done. But for the fact that I am called away to the hospital on account of the sickness of my daughter I should vote for the conference report, but I shall not be able to be present when it is voted upon. I wish to reassert that I do not believe the bill is going to accomplish anything whatever except confusion and disorder, disappointment, if not disgust, and dismay throughout the land, much as I hope to the contrary.

[From the Chambersburg Repository.]

THE FARMER'S SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

From reports Repository has been able to gather from over the county there is going to be a material shortage in crops this year as compared with last year. We have made a special effort to learn facts from the farmers as they visit Chambersburg, and all seem to have the same report to make.

No person can justly criticize the farmers of Franklin County after the great efforts they made last year. Nor can anyone question their loyalty to the Government and their desire to help in every way possible to win this war. The question is, Have they been given the square deal they deserve?

The cry is everlastingly going up to conserve food here at home that we may be able to ship more abroad. "Do not waste" is what we see placarded all over the country, and glaring electric signs in large cities tell the people the same thing. And the people, largely, are complying with the request, but what are we to save for our men at the front and in the camps, as well as our allies, if we fail to produce? Production is the great thing that is necessary to win the war. Saving is entirely proper, but production must first be considered and it is being considered, but how? Wheat is the great staple food product and the cry goes up day and night, "Give us more wheat and save the flour that we may have more wheat." The farmers are asked to produce wheat in greater quantities, yet wheat is the one item of farm production on which the Government places a fixed price and says, "So far shalt thou go and no farther."

What is the condition of the farmer, the man who produces the wheat and who is urged to accomplish greater results than he has been able to do in the past? He finds himself confronted by a price fixed for his crop of wheat. People who do not go into all the facts say that is a good price and any man should be able to raise it at that price. Let us see. Place the normal price of wheat at \$1 and the price fixed by the Government is an increase slightly over 100 per cent of the normal. The farmer in order to sustain his family and keep up his farm is obliged, like every one else, to buy other things. Does he find a price fixed on these? Not at all. He pays anywhere from 200 to 300 per cent more for what he buys than he formerly did. Foodstuffs, feed for his stock, machinery of all kinds, fertilizer, everything has advanced far more than the advance allowed him on his wheat.

Another thing. It is impossible to procure help on the farm. The young men whom the Government has not taken away for the Army have found employment in cantonments, manufactories, and elsewhere at wages the farmer could not think of paying. Without help how is he expected to increase his production? He simply can not do it. The result will be that he will sow this year only what he can reap himself and with what aid he can procure from his own family, which, in many cases, has been materially depleted by the draft. The farmer can do so much and no more, and that is just what he will do this year, and this means a big shortage in wheat and all other crops. It is absolutely ridiculous to insist that the farmer should do the impossible.

If crops are to be increased there is but one way to do it. The Government must either stop taking the boys from the farm or provide others to take their places. If the war is to be won by greater production of wheat and other farm crops, men are just as essential on the farm as they are in the trenches, and the Government should make some provision to supply them. There are thousands of men employed in various branches of industry where nonessentials are produced. There are men clerking in stores and in other places where women could fill the positions just as well. If food production is as essential as carrying a gun and the Government can draft for the latter, why can not it do so for the former? It is not improbable that we will come to this before very long. A man has just as much right to sacrifice in order that food can be secured as has the man to sacrifice his business to enter the Army as a soldier. If something like this is not done we may expect greatly reduced crops, not because farmers are unwilling to do their full part, but because they are deprived of the help necessary to produce the crops now demanded. If this war is to be won through the production of large crops to feed the Army and allies, the farmers must be given help with which to do it.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OVERMYER].

Mr. OVERMYER. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say, as I stated a while ago, that I had intended to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a letter from the Provost Marshal General touching the question of farm labor. On investigation, however, I find that a letter in substance the same was inserted in the RECORD under the date of the 25th instant by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McKEOWN]. The letter contains a great deal of interesting information, especially showing the percentage of farm labor that has actually been withdrawn in the first draft and that will be probably withdrawn in the second draft. I quite agree with the statement of the Provost Marshal General in that regard, that the dearth of farm labor is not due in any large degree to the operation of the draft. It is due to a variety of causes that have been in operation for a number of years. The migration of people toward the city, the suction of industries during the past two or three years, with high wage scales in the cities, has done more to create the present dearth in farm labor than the operation of the draft, and the letter gives interesting figures on that subject.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OVERMYER. I regret I can not yield to my colleague.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me I desire to submit the report of the commission created by Congress to investigate the pneumatic mail-tube service.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE PNEUMATIC-TUBE MAIL SERVICE.

The commission appointed by the act of Congress dated March 3, 1917, to investigate the value of pneumatic-tube mail service, submits herewith the report of its investigations, together with the report of its engineers and auditors, a tran-

script of the public hearings, and copies of reports and briefs submitted by the Post Office Department and the owners of tube properties.

Under the provisions of the act creating the commission, it is directed, first, to investigate the value of the tube service; second, the value of its properties, franchises, and other equipment, with a view to the purchase and operation of the same or any portion thereof by the Government; and, third, to ascertain the cost and terms upon which such purchase may be made. Broadly interpreted, the commission was directed to determine whether the tubes are a valuable and necessary postal facility for a reliable and expeditious mail service in the larger cities.

After having given careful consideration to the testimony submitted at public hearings in the different cities, an inspection of pneumatic-tube service; a consideration of the report of its engineers and auditors, and the briefs submitted by the Post Office Department and the tube companies, the commission has reached the following conclusions:

1. That pneumatic tubes as now installed for carrying letter mail are necessary for proper postal service and should be continued in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, and St. Louis, but that extensions are necessary in St. Louis to obtain adequate tube service.

2. That being an exclusive postal facility, the systems should be owned and operated by the Government.

3. That a combination of tube and automobile service tends to promote efficient postal service in large cities.

4. That the Post Office Department should operate tube service with its own employees, thereby insuring greater cooperation.

5. That the purchase price of the tube systems should be extended over a period of years in such a manner that partial payments, together with 4 per cent interest on unpaid balances, including costs of operation as reported by the commission's engineers, shall not exceed the present annual expenditure of approximately \$976,000 for tube service.

6. That the purchase price for the systems now in use in the Postal Service be determined by a reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission, who shall fix a physical valuation for each of the systems in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, and St. Louis at a sum not to exceed \$4,432,622 for the entire systems. In determining these values, said commission shall consider the nature and condition of the titles to the properties in each of the cities named.

The commission has given careful and extended study and investigation, first, to the utility value of underground pneumatic-tube service as a postal facility in the large cities where the quantity of first-class mail and street congestion demand special consideration; second, to the subject of Government ownership of such methods of mail transportation; and, third, to what is a fair valuation of the properties of the tube companies now under contract with the Post Office Department. For some time this subject has been before Congress. Each member of the commission, by reason of service on the Post Office Committees of the House and Senate, had already given the subject considerable thought and study. A mass of testimony, data, and information has heretofore been submitted during hearings before the House and Senate Post Office Committees and in previous congressional and departmental reports.

The systems in the five cities mentioned are privately owned and operated under contract with the Post Office Department, for which Congress has appropriated during the last 11 years approximately \$1,000,000 per year. A 10-year contract for tube service expired June 30, 1916, and since that time the service has been continued by congressional action.

On July 16, 1915, the Postmaster General appointed a committee of postal experts "to make careful investigation and report as to the needs and practicability of pneumatic-tube service in Boston, Mass.; New York, N. Y.; Brooklyn, N. Y.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Chicago, Ill.; and St. Louis, Mo., preliminary to the consideration by the Postmaster General of the issuance of an advertisement for such service for the term beginning July 1, 1916, the report to be submitted not later than October 1, 1915." Their report was filed with the Postmaster General October 13, 1916. He extended the contracts to December 31, 1916. Congress afterwards extended the contracts first to March 4, 1917, and later, in connection with the authorization of this commission, to July 1, 1918.

The report of the postal experts recommended the discontinuance of tube service in all the cities, with the exception of that portion in New York below Forty-second Street, and recommended the retention of the service above Forty-second Street only on condition that it could be secured at a very material reduction in cost.

The recommendations of the Postmaster General coming before Congress for consideration were attacked by Members of Congress, the public, the press, and by the owners of tube properties. Hearings were conducted by the Committees on Post Offices and Post Roads both in the House and in the Senate. They extended over a period of four days before the House committee, and for six days before the Senate committee. The House of Representatives voted to continue the usual appropriation for tube service, and an additional amount for an extension to The Bronx in New York City. The Senate amended the provision by continuing the existing service and authorized the appointment of this commission, which action was later concurred in by the House.

The views of the Postmaster General with respect to tube service may be summarized as follows: That since 1906, when the present contracts were made, the postal conditions have so changed that the tube service is neither necessary nor desirable. The reasons assigned are stated to be:

1. The introduction of parcel post.
2. The use of automobile mail trucks.
3. Increase of letter mail to a point beyond the capacity of the existing tubes.

The commission, therefore, has given careful study to the utility value of pneumatic-tube mail service, has instructed its engineers to make thorough and careful investigation into this phase of their inquiry, and has itself endeavored to ascertain accurately the views and reasons of the public and postal employees as to the value and the necessity for providing such a means of transportation for first-class mail. It has examined the reports of previous post-office administrations, and particularly the report of the congressional investigation submitted to Congress in 1914, of which Senator HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, was chairman. Indeed, the investigation of this latter commission enabled this commission to avoid a great amount of work which it otherwise would have been required to do.

The commission has carefully kept in mind the distinction between the importance of the delivery of first-class mail, in which the Government has a monopoly, and that of other classes of mail delivered through the Postal Service. The former commands a high rate of postage. It is closely identified with the social, business, financial, and industrial life of the Nation, and therefore demands special treatment.

It can not be permitted, except at the expense of efficiency, to go other than in the most direct lines, without delay or hindrance, from the point of origin to destination. Any other consideration that would retard or slacken its progress would ignore the very important duty the Government owes the public to provide a highly developed first-class mail service. Rapid transmission of first-class mail should be provided independent of and divorced from the movement of the less important and lower classes of mail. No other course can be reconciled with the proper and just demands of the public or the duty the Government owes to the patrons of the Postal Service, who provide the funds with which it is maintained. But for first-class mail the social and business fabric of the Nation would be greatly impaired. The greater the efficiency, therefore, in the methods and devices adopted to improve the service the greater it stimulates the social and commercial activities of the people.

All of the larger financial institutions located in the great cities, and many of the large business and manufacturing concerns having active relations with clients, customers, or branches located outside the city, rely upon the mails for handling and recording thousands of necessary details involved in the orderly conduct of their business affairs. Many of them do not rely upon the postman for collections and deliveries, but at their own expense maintain a special service between their offices and the post office or station through which their mail is cleared. Some of them, especially the great banking institutions, send for and receive their mail, in some instances, every 30 minutes during business hours; and many of them maintain such a service, though less frequently, during the entire night in order that clients and customers may sustain the least possible delay with respect to business intrusted to them through the mails.

It is not a question of what character of service is sufficient, but what is the best possible service, within reasonable limits of expense, that can be provided for such important customers of the Postal Service. It must be understood, however, that each patron of the Postal Service can not always receive that degree of service which his individual business demands or that he feels he should have. The Postal Service must be maintained with due regard for conditions in any given locality and in the country as a whole. The policy of those responsible for efficient postal management should be, however, to keep pace with the growth and development of the country and the necessity for a constantly improved service.

The viewpoint of the public, as it appears to the commission, is that letter mail pays for and warrants the highest grade of postal service; that there should be no deterioration in the service; that where cities are spending millions of dollars to widen streets and to put traffic above ground and underground, the Government should not add to that traffic by abandoning existing means of underground transportation of mail; that the mail truck is a menace to the life of persons along the streets and tends to obstruct traffic. These are factors in this inquiry which the commission considers are established by the facts.

The tubes carry a large portion of the first-class mail in the cities where established. They were constructed with the sole purpose of facilitating the delivery of letter mail. To replace the tubes with automobiles would doubtless effect an economy, estimated by Stone & Webster, engineers for the commission, at \$114,522 per year. The commission is of the opinion, however, that delays in the delivery of large quantities of letter mail would result from this action. In this connection the engineers say:

No number of automobiles, even at a cost exceeding that of the best combined automobile and tube service, could obtain all the advantages of a combined service.

The records of the Post Office Department indicate that from three to five million letters are advanced in delivery each day by the tubes, which otherwise would be delayed. The commission feels that the additional cost for providing expedition for this amount of mail is fully justified. The engineers for the commission estimate that the extra expense of tube service under Government ownership as compared with the cost of the necessary automobile service to replace the tubes, if discontinued, would be about \$312 a day. The commission concludes that for this sum Congress can well afford to provide this special service for three to five million letters daily that are enabled thereby to reach their destination earlier, which would not be true if tube service were dispensed with.

Mr. Rouse, a member of the commission, does not agree with the recommendations above stated and will submit a minority report.

At the suggestion of the commission, the secretary has prepared and appended hereto, under appropriate subdivisions, certain data and comments, approved by the commission, regarding the various phases of the investigation under consideration.

J. H. BANKHEAD (chairman).  
THOMAS W. HARDWICK.  
JOHN W. WEEKS.  
THOS. M. BELL.  
HALVOR STEENERSON.

MARCH 1, 1918.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I will.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand the commission recommends a continuance of the pneumatic-tube service in certain cities under certain circumstances.

Mr. BELL. No.

Mr. RANDALL. Are there any cities which have had that service that are omitted from the recommendation?

Mr. BELL. None, so far as I am advised.

Mr. RANDALL. What about San Francisco?

Mr. BELL. Well, I did not know San Francisco ever had this pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. RANDALL. It has had it in the past. I would like to ask whether the commission visited San Francisco before this report was made?

Mr. BELL. The truth is this commission was called upon under the resolution adopted by Congress not to recommend the discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube service only in event the commission came to the conclusion that it was not a good postal facility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman have any objection to my using five minutes of this time? If not, I will yield five minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, Tuesday, February 5, 1918, is a day that will long be remembered by the American people. The transport *Tuscania*, with 2,179 American soldiers on board, on their way to the battle fields of Europe, was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine when off the north coast of Ireland, and 209 American soldiers were lost or unaccounted for.

The news of the sinking of the transport *Tuscania* was flashed over the country and brought home most forcibly to every mother and father in the land the sad realization of war.

The War Department was besieged by people and thousands of telegrams were received by it inquiring of the safety of the boys who were either on or were supposed to be on the *Tuscania*.

With commendable promptness and accuracy the War Department made public the list of survivors as they were received by cable.

All are familiar with the vivid accounts given by the press of the torpedoing and sinking of the *Tuscania* on the eve of February 5 by a German submarine; of the tremendous impact and explosion when the torpedo struck the transport; of the lowering of the lifeboats and of the transport settling deeper and deeper in the water; of the fine discipline, splendid nerve, and heroic courage of our boys thousands of miles away from their homes, as they stood at attention, with the Stars and Stripes floating over their heads, waiting their turn to take the lifeboats, every man as cool and under as much self-control as if on dress parade. The fact that out of 2,179 men on board only 209 were lost in this disaster, under all the circumstances, with German submarines lurking in the vicinity, is a high testimonial to the splendid order and self-control of the officers and men. Most of the soldiers rescued were landed at Buncrana and Larne, Ireland, Wednesday morning, February 6, and also on the Scottish coast.

At these small ports of Ireland and Scotland where our troops were landed they met a most warm-hearted reception on the part of the people who did all in their power to administer every comfort and care. The survivors of the *Tuscania* laid their dead comrades at rest, with the usual military honors, on the rock-bound coast of Scotland, where proper monuments will be erected to mark their graves.

On Fame's eternal camping ground  
Their silent tents are spread,  
And Glory guards, with solemn sound,  
The bivouac of the dead.

Nor shall their glory be forgot  
While Fame her record keeps,  
Or Honor points the hallowed spot  
Where Valor proudly sleeps.

#### WISCONSIN'S PROUD RECORD.

Wisconsin has responded to the call of the country in this war, as in all others, with a patriotism second to no other State. In 1861, within six days after Lincoln's first call for volunteers, Wisconsin responded with its first regiment, and 19 companies more had offered their services. At that time, with a population of only a trifle over 700,000, Wisconsin raised an army of between 90,000 and 100,000 men. After the declaration of war with Spain the War Department was surprised at the early wire from the Governor of Wisconsin to "Send on your medical officers, our National Guard is ready." Wisconsin's second and third regiments were among the earliest arrivals at the camp in Chickamauga.

In the present war no State in the Union has responded more loyally to every demand made by the President than Wisconsin. The United States Naval Institute proceedings of August, 1917, contains a table compiled by the Department of War. This table shows, first, the quota required from each State; second, the number of the National Guard on April 2, 1917; third, the enlistments in the National Guard from April 2 to June 30, 1917; fourth, the enlistments in the Regular Army during the same period; fifth, each State is credited with the total in service on April 2 and the enlistments up to June 30, 1917; sixth, the number of men to be drafted. These figures show the total of the National Army at the last-named date as 1,152,985. The total credits, including those in service on April 2 and those volunteering up to June 30, are 465,985; this left 687,000 to be drafted. The total credits form 40.4 per cent of the Army. Wisconsin's volunteers numbered over 54 per cent of her quota.

Wisconsin thus ranks first in the percentage of credits; in other words, more of her citizens volunteered in proportion to the quota assigned than any other State in the Union. I herewith give a table showing the figures from 12 of the most populous States:

	Quota.	Credits.	Per cent.
New York.....	122,424	52,971	43.2
Pennsylvania.....	98,277	37,248	37.0
Illinois.....	79,094	27,304	34.5
Ohio.....	66,474	27,585	41.5
Texas.....	48,166	17,488	36.3
Michigan.....	43,938	13,569	30.8
Massachusetts.....	43,109	22,448	52.0
New Jersey.....	35,623	14,896	41.8
Missouri.....	35,461	16,740	47.2
California.....	34,907	11,783	33.7
Indiana.....	29,971	12,409	41.5
Wisconsin.....	28,199	15,274	54.3

Wisconsin was the first State to report its registration list to the War Department at Washington under the recent conscription law, and it overran the Government's estimate in its registration. It oversubscribed its apportionment in both

Liberty bond issues, and very much oversubscribed its quota for the Red Cross. One city of 20,000 inhabitants in the district I represent subscribed over \$40,000 to the Red Cross. Every city and hamlet in the State has its Red Cross Society, and all are working overtime.

In reading the names of the soldiers who were on the *Tuscania* you will recognize the names of many nationalities. The roster of our great National Army contains the names of almost all nationalities, all Americans, all united in one single purpose—that of winning the war—and inspired by one great motive, love and loyalty for their common country, America.

I ask leave, Mr. Speaker, to print as an extension of my remarks the names of the soldiers from the eighth congressional district who were on the *Tuscania* and those who lost their lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by printing the list indicated. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The list is as follows:

SAVED.

J. L. Barnes, Wautoma; Joseph Bauer, Wautoma; O. Bendixen, Wautoma; W. J. Berry, Wautoma; W. J. Callahan, Wautoma; C. Buchholtz, Wautoma; L. Byse, Wautoma; E. Campbell, Wild Rose; Warren Cotton, Coloma; W. D. S. Horne, Redgranite; L. Garthwaite, Wautoma; Henry Gethers, Coloma; A. W. Grambsch, Bloomfield; Earl Wilder, Coloma; A. Zielke, Redgranite; J. J. Johnson, Wautoma; S. Jarvis, Wautoma; E. F. Klemer, Wautoma; A. D. Robins, Wautoma; A. W. Persons, Wautoma; H. H. Rowe, Wautoma; G. L. Gunderson, Wautoma; N. Perry, jr., Plainfield; Vernon Rozell, jr., Plainfield; Clyde Diggle, Hancock; Glen Diggle, Hancock; A. Thorstad, Wautoma; C. Stratton, Wautoma; R. Simonson, Wautoma; M. J. Johnson, Wild Rose; Ernest Rogers, Coloma; Royal Pierce, Coloma; Edward Ueck, Hancock; F. Reider, Wautoma; N. F. Jensen, Pine River; Joe Parkin, Coloma; E. P. Patterson, Wild Rose; G. H. Gustin, Wautoma; Creal Hopper, Coloma; T. A. Gehrke, Auroraville; Joe Inda, Wild Rose; A. L. Perron, Plainfield; C. W. Knaup, Poy Sippi; L. W. Spear, Plainfield; H. R. Turner, Wautoma; N. Colligan, Wild Rose; I. Peterson, Saxeville; A. P. Seising, Mount Morris; John Inda, Wild Rose; L. D. Paulson, Poy Sippi; C. G. Larson, Saxeville; L. H. McCue, Poy Sippi; Herman McLaughlin, Coloma; J. Swendrzynski, Wild Rose; R. F. Lind, Poy Sippi; I. Sorenson, Wild Rose; T. Dubke, Plainfield; H. R. Amelgh, Plainfield; C. W. Eagan, Wautoma; Joe Stransky, Coloma; Paul Buettner, Shawano; Clarence Kroeger, Plover; Melvin A. Arneson, Abbottsford; Ray Anderson, Marshfield; Fred Bream, jr., Marshfield; Lyie Barnhart, Waupaca; Arthur Cantwell, Shawano; Byron E. Christian, Wautoma; George E. Doman, New London; Tracey S. Green, Colby; Alexander Steward, jr., Clintonville; Olin R. Thompson, Abbottsford; John C. Barth, Clintonville; Archibald Beaudoin, New London; George D. Danley, Iola; Kirkwood Durrant, Waupaca; Martin E. Evenson, Manawa; Hilding Pagedahl, Clintonville; Charles Foley, New London; George J. Schunk, Marshfield; Herbert E. Hurd, Almond; John Jacobson, Waupaca; Charles H. Jacobson, Waupaca; Ryder L. Lee, Northland; John Loftis, Waupaca; Theodore Regling, Shawano; Leo W. Spear, Plainfield; Ralph R. Wescott, Shawano; Herman J. Christiansen, Pittsview; Charles Decker, Berlin; Arthur Evenson, Marshfield; John M. Maitland, Berlin; Ralph A. Mayo, New London; Carl Emigh, Neskoro; Irvin A. Eckel, Marshfield; William E. Jacobson, Waupaca; Lee V. Lashua, Northland; Halbert I. Lewis, Stevens Point; Ellsworth W. Ming, Iola; John A. Lonnevick, Ogdensvik; Halle Damas, Marshfield; Deane R. Knapton, Marshfield; Francis F. Firnstahl, Colby; Jacob W. Kramer, Abbottsford; and Edmund Palmer Johnson, Iola.

DEAD OR UNACCOUNTED FOR.

Russell F. Bennett, Plainfield; Corpl. Clifford Norriss, New London; Charles E. Swanson, Rothschild; Alcide Corolla, Lohrville; and William B. Spencer, New London.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman have any objection if I should yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, some time ago the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] received permission to extend his remarks in the Record by printing an editorial by a distinguished Democratic editor. Now I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the Record the remarks of one who I think is the greatest living Democratic editor, the Hon. Henry Watterson, which appeared in last Saturday's Washington Post.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by making a part thereof the editorial referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides nearly \$70,000,000 for the expenses of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the Government, a great proportion of which is for salaries in the executive departments in the city of Washington. The expenses of the executive departments in the city of Washington have grown enormously in the last year and promise to grow still more during the coming year. The pay roll in the city of Washington now is approximately \$70,000,000 a year. Prior to the war it was about \$50,000,000 a year. That money, of course, must be raised not only by taxation of the people but, in this emergency, by the sale of bonds. I have urged on this House, and expect to continue to urge

upon it, the absolute, imperative necessity of getting an honest day's work for every dollar expended by Uncle Sam, and I am at a loss somewhat to see why the simple proposal to adopt a standard day of eight hours for the employees of the Government in the District of Columbia should raise such a tremendous objection as it has raised. It apparently finds opponents even on the floor of this House.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. For a brief question.

Mr. LONDON. The gentleman has used the expression "a standard day of eight hours."

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. What does the gentleman mean by that expression, "a standard day"?

Mr. BORLAND. I will say to the gentleman from New York that my judgment is—and I hope that he can concur with me, that there is just as much an honest day's work as an honest dollar or an honest pound or an honest bushel. I would not deal with a merchant who tried to fix his own standard of what constituted a pound.

I would not deal with a man who attempted to tell me how many cents he would give me for a dollar or leave it as a matter of bargaining and chaffering between us, and I believe there is just as much an honest day's work as there is an honest dollar or an honest pound.

Mr. LONDON. The gentleman used the expression, "a standard day."

Mr. BORLAND. I want to answer my friend a little further. I have no sympathy with those people who claim that a day's work is eight hours or less, how much less depending upon how shrewd one party to the trade may be and how helpless the other may be. I have just as little sympathy with them as I have for a man who says that he will get just as much out of the laborer as he can, or that the laborer is not to earn a living.

And there is just as much moral limit to one proposition as there is to the other, in my mind. I hope there is in the mind of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONDON. I tried to get a definition of the standard day, because I proceed upon the theory that an honest day's work means a day's work in which the man applies himself to the utmost of his ability to the task allotted to him.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is now in the realm of fog. An honest day's work is the standard that is customarily fixed by the community. When you talk about what a man can efficiently apply himself to, that is mere fog. A merchant might say he would give as many ounces to the pound as his own aspirations required. I want to say that nobody is going to get the worst of that shifting scale any quicker than the laborer is going to get it. He has always got the worst of it when there is not a standard fixed by law.

If the value of a dollar is the matter of bargain in the market place, the poor man always gets the worst of it. If a pound is the matter of shrewdness of dealing, the poor always get the worst of it.

And if an honest day's work is not set by all the community, the poor and the unfortunate get the worst of it and the shrewd and powerful get the best of it. There is not a bit of doubt about that.

I do not think it is necessary for me to explain to the great majority of this House what is meant by an honest day's work. The only question is why have we not gotten the honest day's work from the employees of the Government in the District of Columbia? Cleared of all the technicalities that have been brought in here, all the shrewdness at the command of the people opposing this amendment, it is that it would cut \$7,000,000 off of Uncle Sam's pay roll in the District of Columbia. The merchants and landlords of Washington will not submit to the loss of that revenue. That is sufficient answer for all the opposition. It is a square issue between the taxpayers of the Nation and the profiteers of Washington.

I want to read here a letter that I sent to the secretary of a labor union in my district, and I will ask the Clerk to read it from the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1918.

MR. JAMES H. ANDERSON,  
Secretary Central Labor Union, Labor Temple, Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: I have your letter of February 20 inclosing a set of resolutions adopted by the Central Labor Union February 9, 1918, in regard to the so-called Borland amendment. It seems clear that

these resolutions were suggested by somebody in Washington, and I regret exceedingly that the unions in Kansas City have not had an opportunity to go into the facts of this matter a little more fully.

The overwhelming majority of the present National Army which our country is putting in the field to fight the great battle of democracy is composed of the sons of working men. The life of every one of these boys is as precious to his father as the life of the son of a millionaire. No department of our Government ought to fail to exercise the highest degree of vigilance and efficiency to support this Army in the field. Not one of these boys should be sacrificed by negligence or delay, and our Government and our President are anxious to have at this time the loyal cooperation of all of the Government employees. The President sticks to his post with unrelenting fidelity. Congress is working hard and not measuring its hours of service. Men in the mechanical trades of the United States and the Government arsenals and shipyards are working a full eight hours and longer, and there is no reason why the clerks in the departments at Washington should continue to enjoy political privileges and favoritism.

It may mean the prolonging of this war and the sacrifice of thousands of working men's sons. It may mean many sad households in this land; many bereaved mothers, many widows and many fatherless children, many of whom will be among the class of the world's workers.

We are facing a vigilant and relentless foe, and the horrible thing about this disgraceful protest which the Washington clerks are making is that it does not ring true with the best and highest note of Americanism. It does not mean a nation in earnest to win this war at the least sacrifice of blood and treasure.

I am inclosing herewith some resolutions which I hope and trust will be more expressive of the real sentiments of your union. I wish you would read this letter and these resolutions at the next meeting of your body. With kindest regards, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

(Signed) WILLIAM P. BORLAND.

Mr. BORLAND. Ah, there is an answer, of course, as to why the clerks can not work more than seven hours a day. It is the \$7,000,000 added to the Government pay roll for the benefit of the business men of Washington. That is always the answer that bobs up like Banquo's ghost. Do you talk about the boys in the field? Seven million dollars jingling in Washington will drown out the cries of the boys across the sea. You talk about the fatherless orphans and widows; \$7,000,000 spent in the Nation's Capital would still the cries of the widows and orphans. Do you talk about winning the war for democracy? No. You are winning the war for the profiteers of the Nation's Capital. Seven million dollars added to the pay roll, and every man who gets on the floor of this House to oppose the eight-hour day is consciously or unconsciously talking for the \$7,000,000 patriots in the city of Washington.

Now, having answered the sophistry to the effect that this is not in the interest of the laboring man, I want to answer another sophistry, that it is in the power now of the departments in Washington to require eight hours a day and that they are doing it. It is a sufficient answer to that to say that if they were doing it nobody would be injured by an eight-hour day, and there would not be any doubt about the matter. It is manifest the clerks are not putting in an eight-hour day or they would not object to the change.

But the law provides for a seven-hour day. Gentlemen have gotten up here very blandly and said that there was an eight-hour day provided for now. There is an eight-hour day provided for the mechanical laborers of the Government, but not for these clerical positions.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BORLAND. I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman listen to me?

Mr. BORLAND. I have listened to you a good while on the question of the shortage of labor on the farms, in which I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman has not listened to me very much.

Mr. BORLAND. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. FOCHT. I want information. I do not want to take your time. At this juncture I would like to ascertain, speaking of that \$7,000,000 less paid out, if that means you are going to reduce the wages \$7,000,000?

Mr. BORLAND. I will explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. FOCHT. Also let me ask you this: At the present rate, if what has been said in regard to the employment of these 60,000 or more people that have been called to the city of Washington is true, they can scarcely exist, and how are you going to reduce their wages?

Mr. BORLAND. Why are you bringing them?

Mr. FOCHT. They are here and can not get home.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Pennsylvania consumed some time this afternoon. He talked about the shortage of labor on the farm. He knows the question of labor on the farm is a question of competition. He knows you can not get labor on the farm when a colored man can come down here to Washington and get \$3 a day and sit in a revolving chair kicking his heels in front of an office door in one of these buildings.

The gentleman wants a seven-hour day for that employee. How are you going to get him back to the farm? And he will

probably fight for an increase of wages for that employee, not realizing that he is putting his farmer friend up against further competition in the labor market.

Mr. FOCHT. Pardon me, but when you speak of what I would do, let me suggest that there are no colored laborers or any other laborers from my district coming to Washington so long as there are any left down South or out in the gentleman's district in Missouri. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORLAND. There are more Republican laborers, according to my observation, than Democrats in the District of Columbia. The gentleman would know that if he were in anywise familiar with the condition of the departments.

Now, I want to puncture this idea that an eight-hour day is already provided in the law. The statute reads:

Hereafter it shall be the duty of the heads of the executive departments, in the interest of the public service, to require of all clerks and other employees of whatever grade or class in their respective departments not less than seven hours of labor each day, except Sundays and days declared public holidays by law or Executive order: *Provided*, That the heads of departments may by special order, stating the reasons, further extend the hours for clerks or employees in their departments.

That provides for a seven-hour standard, and it can be exceeded by a special order, stating the reasons, in the case of each of these employees. Now, of course, there are bureaus in Washington where, by special order stating the reason, the time is exceeded to-day on account of war preparations, but 65 or 70 per cent of the civil-service employees in Washington are in bureaus where no special order could be issued stating any reason, and that is exactly the class of people we must reach.

The whole Commerce Department, the whole Labor Department, the whole Department of Justice—in fact, all of the departments, except a few bureaus in the Treasury and of the War and Navy Departments—are on a seven-hour basis, and as that is the standard fixed by law you can not change it, except by special order, stating the reason. Legislation by Congress is clearly necessary to remedy the abuse.

Now, my bill provides an eight-hour basis within the same limitations, namely, that you can not increase the hours without stating the reasons and a special order, and you have the standard of eight hours instead of a standard of seven hours, with the same limitations applying to it.

That disposes of all this talk as to whether there is or is not a standard eight-hour day or whether the departments have the power to grant it. In all the departments that are now working on a seven-hour basis they are using an excessive number of people. Those people ought to be put on an eight-hour basis, and the excess ought to be put in the War and Navy Departments, where they are needed, so that it would not be necessary to bring more people to the city of Washington, still further to aggravate the high prices that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] has spoken of.

The Civil Service Commission reports that in the last year 30,000 additional employees have been passed for Government service. They are not all on this bill. Many of them are in the sundry civil bill, because they are in what are called independent Government establishments. But the civil-service report shows that there are 30,000 additional employees. We had 37,000 here before the war began, so that we have approximately 67,000 now, or will have before the close of the fiscal year. We are taking those from the productive industries of the country.

Who is benefiting from this? The profiteers of Washington. Let us see if the man who is opposing this can even pose as the friend of the Government clerks. What self-respecting Government clerk ought to refuse to work eight hours a day? And if he did, what would he profit himself? What advantage to the individual clerk is there in having an excessive number of people on the Government's pay roll? None. It is a great disadvantage to him. In the first place, it does not put him in a very good light with his fellow citizens outside of the District of Columbia. In the second place, it clogs up the office and reduces his chances of promotion. In the third place, it reduces his chance for an adequate increase of salary as compensation for his services; and, in the fourth place, it practically destroys his chance of securing the enactment of a proper retirement law. So that the individual clerk is undoubtedly a loser by this agitation for a seven-hour-day proposition. Who is the gainer? The \$7,000,000 patriots of the city of Washington; and every time you turn and look at this proposition from a new angle you get but one view, and that is the \$7,000,000 padding of the Government pay roll for the benefit of the landlords and merchants of Washington. You can not prove that any individual in or out of the District of Columbia is benefited by a

seven-hour day except these men who live off of the earnings of the clerks.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I yield to my colleague.

Mr. COX. As to the salaries paid to Government clerks and the salaries paid by private employers, I want to say that a very bright young woman came into my office this week, a young woman from Indiana, whose husband had been in the Navy for nine years and is now in the war zone, either in England or in France, and has made an assignment to her of all he proposes to make.

She has a little girl three and a half years old. She sought employment in one of the leading department stores here in the city of Washington. Last July she got the munificent sum of \$7 a week. She is now getting the magnificent sum of \$9 a week, and she tells me that the average pay roll of the salesladies in this leading department store does not exceed \$12.50 a week, working eight hours every day in the year, except Sunday. That is the true condition. Yet there is no question but what that department store is agitating increased payments to Government clerks.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BORLAND. I will in just a moment. I want to say that what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has heard is mostly the clamor of the opposition. What I have said will find a very small space in the Record. In all the amount of brains that the \$7,000,000 stake has produced, they have not dared to compare the scale of prices or the terms of service or the hours of service or the number of working days in the year in a single private industry in the whole District of Columbia, and in the District of Columbia are located the general offices of the American Federation of Labor. They have not compared our office force with that office force, either in terms of service or in pay. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I want to say right here only this: That to me the wages paid by private employers do not necessarily constitute the standard for the Government of the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. I should like to yield only for a question.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Many private employers pay niggardly wages, and the Government of the United States, which is the wealthiest employer in the world, ought always to pay a living wage regardless of what private employers pay.

Mr. BORLAND. I regret that the gentleman from Wisconsin, who, ordinarily, is very courteous, has not taken advantage of the courtesy I have extended to him to ask me a question instead of making a comment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I will ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BORLAND. I refuse to yield now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman think what is paid by private employers necessarily constitutes a fair criterion as to what the Government ought to pay?

Mr. BORLAND. Then the gentleman is condemning the American Federation of Labor, which is a private employer, with the same class of office force in the District of Columbia. Why, of course, what private employers pay is a criterion, because it fixes the standard of wages. What men pay in the market for potatoes fixes the price of potatoes. You can say the Government ought to pay more for potatoes, and perhaps that is a good argument if you have got potatoes to sell. What people will ordinarily pay for a thing under similar conditions or under the best conditions is the criterion.

Mr. COX. Was there not a strike in the city of Washington in the offices of the American Federation of Labor a couple of years ago?

Mr. BORLAND. On that very question—that the force down there, as I understand it, wanted the same hours of labor and the same pay as the Federation was demanding from the Federal Government, and the strikers did not get it. Now, I will ask the Clerk to read in my time a comment from a leading Democratic country newspaper in Missouri, one of the best-edited country newspapers in the State, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Jackson Examiner, Independence, Mo.]

MICE IN THE MEAL BAG.

Congressman BORLAND has got a glimmer of the labor situation and it should be sufficient to let the light into other places which may be dark. Mr. BORLAND suggests that the thousands of clerks in the departments in Washington be required to work eight hours a day instead of seven, as now, and points out the fact that this additional hour would

equal the employment of 6,000 or 8,000 additional clerks, relieve the congestion, and call upon the Washington employees of the Government for the same number of hours now recognized as a standard day by men employed, not by the employers, who often work eight hours before noon and eight hours after noon.

Mr. BORLAND's slogan embodies the entire argument. He demands that an honest day's work be given for every day's pay handed out by Uncle Sam.

Our Member of Congress is absolutely correct. When every patriotic man and woman is straining to meet war emergency and not even looking at the time clock, when hundreds of men are working long hours for no pay at all and happy to make the sacrifice, the office clerks at Washington who do half a day's work may justly be denominated as slackers.

Mr. BORLAND. Oh, there is a reason. Seven million dollars added to the Government pay roll! There is a reason why the Government clerks must occupy that kind of a position before their fellow citizens. And scores of self-respecting clerks have come to me and said that they would be glad to submit to the eight-hour proposition to clear out the dead timber in the Government offices. I should not like to lose faith in human nature and denominate all Government clerks as slackers. Only those who oppose an eight-hour day are slackers.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: The increase of the hours of labor is equivalent to a reduction of salary?

Mr. BORLAND. That is rather an academic question, but not a hard one to answer. It is not equivalent to a reduction of salary at all. If a man is working on piecework, figuring the output of his labor, of course the increase of hours of work is a reduction of the price per unit; there is no question about that; but it is not a reduction when you are figuring on paying employees according to the cost of living in Washington and not the value of the services.

Mr. MORGAN. I have rather assumed that it was true that an increase of the hours of labor was equivalent to a reduction of salary. If that were true, would it not be inconsistent for Congress to increase the hours of labor and at the same time not increase the pay; would they not be working along two different lines?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman is right. I do not think we ought to increase the pay and not increase the hours of labor. But without the increase of wages we are paying them what is supposed to be full time, and we are not getting it. Instead of our demand for a noncompensated hour, we are being short changed, and the taxpayers are paying for it.

Now, who is going to win on this proposition? The profiteers! Everybody has friends except the taxpayer, and his friends are not numerous, especially in the city of Washington. Nobody who lives in Washington cares anything about the taxpayer except that he is the cow to be milked. But I say the taxpayer is entitled to a full day's work, and we are entitled to fix the salary at what we think is a full day's pay.

Mr. LONDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONDON. How old is the law under which they work seven hours?

Mr. BORLAND. It was a war measure passed in 1898. At that time a day's work in the departments here was not more than four, five, or six hours. Up to 1898 the clerks worked four to six hours, as they saw fit. When the war came on in 1898 and the country was facing a foreign foe as it is to-day, it became necessary, as it is now, to get more efficiency, and Congress fixed the number of hours at seven. They had a battle to do it, and we are going through the same battle. I suppose that seven hours was a compromise because it was too big a jump from four hours to eight hours a day. The \$7,000,000 patriots—they probably were \$2,000,000 patriots then, as they have prospered doubtless since—fought the thing down to seven hours.

Mr. LONDON. Has the head of any department now affected by the seven-hour law asked to have a change in the law?

Mr. BORLAND. Now, my friend, I am going to be excused from answering that kind of a question. I could tell the gentleman some interesting facts, but I am not going to do it on the floor of the House.

Mr. LONDON. That is a legitimate question.

Mr. BORLAND. There is only one Cabinet officer who has taken the open position against it, and it is not hard to guess who that gentleman is.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to have the gentleman state whether he has considered this fact: The Government is having some difficulty in getting clerks. Now, I have in mind the fact that comparatively short hours are an inducement to a young man or a young woman to enter the Government service, and

while at first it may seem an advantage it is of some disadvantage. Does not the gentleman think that the Government would secure better service, better talent, with the comparatively short hours than with long hours?

Mr. BORLAND. I think the gentleman is right about the short hours and the many holidays having coaxed a great many people here from the farming community he represents, and made it exceedingly difficult for his constituents to cultivate their farms. The gentleman is entirely right and I agree with him in that whether I agree with him in the idea of helping his constituents or not. It happens that I have only sixty-one hundred farmers in my district, and some very good ones who appreciate the value of service.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. In a minute, I want to answer the second part of the gentleman's question and then I have finished with the gentleman. If we were paying for only seven hours as a basis of pay of a clerk with an 85-cent dollar the gentleman's contention would be right. If a man comes down here too feeble to work eight hours a day, so mentally feeble that he can not stand the ordinary strain and would like to get a job and take it for 85 cents on the dollar, Uncle Sam can do business with him, but I would not. Uncle Sam could hire him and pay him 85 cents on the dollar.

But that is not what you are getting. You are paying for 16 ounces to the pound and getting only 14. That is the trouble with the gentleman, and the gentleman's farmer friend is paying the bill. The money that is being paid out by the American public is going to the merchants and landlords of the District of Columbia, \$7,000,000 of it. I want the gentleman to remember this when he gets back home—\$7,000,000 of the farmers' money in Oklahoma goes into this proposition, and none of it ever goes back to Oklahoma.

Mr. MORGAN. If there are soft snaps at the National Capital I want to see the farmers come here and get them. I do not sympathize with the idea that it is wrong for the farmer boy to come to Washington either as a clerk or as a Member of Congress.

Mr. BORLAND. I am glad the gentleman feels that way about it. I do not believe that the farms of Oklahoma, however, ought to be abandoned to bring the people down here to work seven hours a day when they are not needed. If the gentleman thinks the farmers of Oklahoma want to work 12 hours a day to pay taxes to support seven-hour clerks in Washington he had better ask them. I would not even want to see the farms of Pennsylvania abandoned, because there might not then be enough voters left to return my genial friend to Congress.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma does not think that these people ought to work just seven hours a day and have these farmers pay for it?

Mr. MORGAN. He seems to think that.

Mr. QUIN. Oh, my goodness, there must be a mistake about that.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOCHT. Then, let me ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. BORLAND. That was a mere pleasantry.

Mr. FOCHT. I am sure my dear friend from Missouri has not answered, and being from Missouri he ought to be able to answer it and to give us the information. The gentleman has failed to tell us how you are going to save the \$7,000,000 by making the clerks work one hour more, unless you discharge some of them.

Mr. BORLAND. I can only furnish the argument. I can not furnish the comprehension. Who is getting the benefit of this? Is the taxpayer of the United States getting the benefit? We know that the laboring man is not getting the benefit, the individual clerk is not getting the benefit, union labor is not getting the benefit, the farmer is not getting the benefit. Perhaps the taxpayer is getting the benefit. Perhaps he is going to get so much better work out of these employees by having them work only seven hours a day, and they are going to do such splendid service in those seven hours a day, they are going to make such a brilliant record, that that will be his pay. That, however, has not been the estimate of men who came down here and investigated the situation. Why is it that they resent the report and work of the Efficiency Bureau that would tend to reduce the number of men in each department and expedite business? Every business man who has ever looked into the situation has said that he could take 60 per cent of the clerks and do better work than is now being done; but the whole cumbersome system of excessive employees and the entire red tape which has embarrassed the Government is due to what? The pressure of \$7,000,000 patriots in the city of Washington.

You can not make a reform here without submitting yourself to the most revolting torrent of filth and abuse that can be

concocted by the human mind. I do not want to make any personal reference, because legislation is never a personal matter to me, but that is the situation exactly. No man can even suggest a reform in these departments without making it so personally unpleasant that very few men like to undertake it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BORLAND. How about the soldier in the field? I expect the friends of the clerks will claim that he is benefited by this seven-hour proposition. How about the soldier's mother, who is anxiously praying every night that the Government may nerve its arm to this great struggle, and that it may be soon over, and that her boy may come back home again? She would not call her boy back. No; that is not in the heart of the American mother. She is glad that he was willing to go and able to go and that he did go; she is glad that he wanted to go and do a real man's part. Think of the gall and wormwood that would have been in that mother's heart if her boy did not want to go and if he could not be made to go. Suppose his highest ambition was a seven-hour job in Washington and he did not want to serve his country and his flag? Suppose he wanted to—

Be carried to the skies on flowery beds of ease,

While others fought to win the prize and sailed through bloody seas?

The heart of the whole world goes out in love and reverence to the mother of a hero, but God pity the mother of a slacker!

That mother may turn for help in her suffering to her God; she will get nowhere else sympathy in her shame and suffering. Does the mother of a soldier who is wearing the khaki uniform ask for a seven-hour day in Washington? Ah, no; she wants this Government to be vigilant, alert; she wants it to win this great cause of democracy. She does not want a single American boy sacrificed upon the altar of political cowardice or political incompetency. She wants every precious American hero's life that is laid upon the altar of his country to count for the great cause of democracy. There is only one way now to do that, and that is for all of us to do our full share. All the sacrifices of this war must not fall upon the boys who go to the trenches. There is a large measure of sacrifice for those of us who stay behind.

The business man is bearing his, the taxpayer is bearing his, the farmer is bearing his, the father is bearing his, the mother is baring her breast to the sharpest arrows of fate; she would gladly give her own life if she could bring her boy back safe. None of these people are asking for a seven-hour day in Washington. No; that is being asked for by the \$7,000,000 patriots of Washington. Can any man in this assembly go back home and face an audience composed of fathers and mothers of true American stock, fathers and mothers of boys who are defending the Old Flag upon a foreign field, and tell them that he voted for a seven-hour day in Washington for the convenience of the clerks? Can he tell them that he voted for a seven-hour day because of technicalities in the wording of the law? Can he tell them that he voted for a seven-hour day because of the insistent demand of the \$7,000,000 patriots of the District of Columbia? I credit this House with saying, "No"; that no man will dare or find it in his conscience or his heart to vote for a seven-hour day for the clerks in Washington and leave the father and the mother of the soldier in the field without the vigilant service of the Government to which he is entitled. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take up much time of the committee this afternoon, but I do want to call attention to the fact that the usual spring drive of the Committee on Appropriations is on against the Subtreasuries of the land. On page 63 of the bill, under the heading "Independent Treasury," there is the following provision:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to discontinue the offices of the assistant treasurers at Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cincinnati, New Orleans, New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco within six months after the President shall have proclaimed the termination of the existing state of war between the United States and Germany.

Mr. Chairman, again the city of Baltimore becomes the center of an attack upon its Subtreasury, although this time it is coupled with the other Subtreasury cities of the land, in which it is provided all the Subtreasuries be discontinued within six months after the war. At no time in the history of that great metropolis of the South has there been a time more inopportune for a change of any of its financial institutions or systems. I have frequently told the House Baltimore during the last few years has progressed in population, in manufactures, and in business generally to an unprecedented extent.

The great Bethlehem Steel Co., which acquired what is known as the Sparrows Point Mills slightly more than a year ago, is rapidly expending some \$50,000,000 in the enlargement of its plant, the extension of its territory, and the employment of several thousand additional laborers. The great section to the south of Baltimore Harbor known as Curtis Bay is rapidly expanding so that now some \$40,000,000 has been invested within the last few years in the construction of large industries and the enlargement of those which were there originally, together with the erection of houses for the additional laborers employed.

To such an extent has this development grown that now to the east of it what is known as Curtis Creek, another favored inland harbor, has taken a great step forward. A large shipyard will soon be in operation at this point. The land has been purchased and full development will soon begin.

Perhaps the greatest and more important development at this point is the immense storage warehouses of the Ordnance Bureau of the War Department. This bureau has purchased at that point 900 acres of land upon which there is now being erected immense warehouses for the storage, pending shipment, of war munitions.

That harbor, already 25 feet deep, is now being dredged to a depth sufficient to accommodate the largest ships which must carry these munitions to France. This operation is perhaps one of the largest upon which the Government is now working, and it is expected that it will be completed within the next four months. The buildings are not like those of the cantonments, but are more substantial, and will no doubt be utilized for many years to come.

Just below the city of Baltimore, at what is known as Canton, on the Colgate Creek Branch of the Patapsco River, is now under construction immense machine and repair shops, to which will be brought automobiles, truck, and other things of that nature to be assembled, crated, and shipped abroad. To it will also be brought the damaged trucks for repairs and re-shipment. It is contemplated that the Government will employ not less than 2,000 men at this point.

A large number of shipyards have sprung up in and around our city, and only a few days ago it was announced through the press that a company owning 1,300 acres of land on the south side of our harbor, just east of Curtis Creek, where the large storage warehouses are being erected, with a capitalization of \$5,000,000, was negotiating with the Government for the construction of a number of ships for European service.

Just south of our city about 17 miles is Camp Meade, one of the cantonments established by the War Department for the training of selected men. There are now at that point some 40,000 soldiers and all the necessary help and attendants required for an immense force of that character. Other camps, much smaller, of course, than Camp Meade, are stationed within a short distance of Baltimore. I make mention in particular of that located at Saunders Range, 12 miles from the city; Fort McHenry, which is rapidly being developed into a hospital, and where the modern and up-to-date immigration buildings are to be converted and used for hospital purposes; Fort Howard and Locust Point, where many soldiers belonging to the Coast Artillery Corps, guard the docks, wharves, and munition works of the city; while north of the city is the proving grounds, now employing a vast number of workmen.

This great assemblage of soldiers, development of industries, enlargement of plants, and all those things which necessarily attend the growth of such concerns have sprung up in and around our city within the last two or three years. It will be seen, therefore, that at this time, when business and war necessities require so much money, such great time and energy of every man and woman, the least thing to be desired is anything which will in any wise affect our financial system or jar or disrupt its organization; and this situation will certainly not change within six months after the war.

The Subtreasury of Baltimore was established in 1846, some 72 years ago, so that all of our financial institutions have sprung up in and around this Subtreasury and our people have become accustomed to its presence and to the advantages of such an institution. The Bureau of Efficiency has recommended the suspension of the Subtreasury system, and that the duties of same be placed with the banks and Federal Reserve System now established. The bureau, however, recommends or suggests that the change be postponed until the war is over and normal conditions are again approximated. The bureau further states that it would be possible without confusion to close three of the smaller Subtreasuries at once—Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati.

Baltimore does not want any more experiments. It is not proud of the way it has been treated in reference to the Federal reserve bank. It feels that it has been compelled to do business,

as it were, uphill, transacting business with Richmond so much farther south and a much smaller city than itself, whereas it should be transacting business with a Federal reserve bank established in Baltimore itself, or with those of Philadelphia or New York, where most of its large financial transactions are carried on. I am not complaining of Richmond, nor am I complaining of its people in wanting a Federal reserve bank at that point, but the point I want to make is that Baltimore has not been given the advantages it should be given for a city of its size.

Every city of the size or larger than Baltimore has a Subtreasury and a Federal reserve bank as well. A Federal reserve branch bank was opened in Baltimore to-day, but even in this instance we are not to have a Baltimorean to head it, but a man is to be brought from Richmond and placed at its head. You might suppose that this is being done because a man of experience is wanted, a man who has been engaged in Federal reserve bank work, but when you know that a Baltimorean was sent to Richmond to head the Federal reserve bank and made the greatest success of that bank of all of the system, you can readily perceive that Baltimore can furnish just as good men to head the Federal reserve branch bank as can be brought forward from anywhere in the country. We are glad to have the Federal reserve branch bank, but do you not see that doing business with a branch bank which must report and obtain its authority from the parent bank at Richmond, can not be as satisfactory as having a Federal reserve bank itself in our city. We are glad to have this branch bank, and will give it every support.

All we are asking for the expense and conduct of the Subtreasury at Baltimore is \$31,500—a small amount, indeed, when you consider the advantage it is to the commercial and financial institutions of our city. When you realize that with this small appropriation the Subtreasury at Baltimore is doing a business aggregating some \$314,000,000, an increase of \$90,000,000 over last year, as is shown by the table I hereto attach, I am sure one will readily realize its worth.

*Cash received and disbursed, 1917.*

February	\$20, 136, 755
March	18, 247, 192
April	20, 365, 815
May	21, 394, 096
June	23, 756, 967
July	25, 216, 882
August	26, 244, 554
September	30, 307, 269
October	31, 666, 937
November	29, 274, 221
December	33, 961, 408
January (1918)	33, 736, 636
	314, 308, 732

*Increase of \$90,000,000 over previous year.*

We ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Subtreasury at Baltimore be not molested, and we ask not only for Baltimore but for all the Subtreasury cities as well. We realize that during this immense war in which we are now engaged the slightest interruption in financial affairs will vitally affect the whole community. Baltimore, as I have said, has enjoyed the advantages and the benefits of this Subtreasury for almost three-quarters of a century. Its business men, as I have said before in this House, comprise the large packing industries of our State, which need immense quantities of small change, as do all the other financial and commercial enterprises of our State, and they depend upon the Subtreasury in our city in these matters, wherein it has served them for so many years.

We do not know what advantage and just what power and benefit the Federal reserve branch bank will be to our city. It may be that after we have had that institution for a while we will find that it fulfills all the duties of the Subtreasury and that we have no use for the latter. Let us hope that it will more than perform those duties and that it will be even a greater advantage to our people than the present Subtreasury, with its efficient employees. But we are not impressed with the fact that it is a branch bank. We realize that a branch bank must necessarily report and receive its authority from the parent bank. While it may be true that it will fill all the duties of the Subtreasury, yet our people have not yet been convinced. They do not know. They have not had the opportunity of doing business with it. They have not become accustomed to its mode of doing business. When they do, when it meets all the requirements necessary, and not until then should an effort be made to suspend our Subtreasury, and no law in advance of such test should be enacted.

We do not want anything to happen at this time which will interfere with the immense business we are doing nor which will disturb or inconvenience any of our citizens. We are doing our part in this great war; we are making our contributions to

every claim that is made upon us; we are meeting each and every obligation as it is brought to our attention, and it is certainly as little as this great Government can do to let us alone while we are so busily engaged in so many necessary enterprises and in winning this war.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will yield to the gentleman for a question, but I prefer that he would allow me to finish, and then I will be glad to yield, as I will not occupy very much more time.

The vast business enterprises which I have enumerated, the great Government works which have been established in and around our metropolis, the requirements of our people, the universal strain under which each and every man of our community and every other community is now laboring should tell us that this is certainly not the time to even discuss, much less suspend, the Subtreasury at Baltimore or to place it in suspense.

Let us finish this war, try out the branch bank, enact additional legislation to enable the branch bank to perform the duties of the Subtreasury, and then take up the question of the suspension of the Subtreasury. Do not establish a "Damocles sword" over the Subtreasuries of the land.

You men of other cities who are enjoying the advantages of a Subtreasury and likewise a Federal reserve bank can readily see and understand my reasons for asking that this action be not taken. I hope, therefore, that when this matter is brought before the House that it will be promptly voted down and that we shall be left this valuable institution that we need so badly.

The great necessity for transportation occasioned by the present war has crowded the port of New York, the port of Boston is jammed, and Philadelphia has as much as it can accommodate, and Baltimore has a very considerable part of the business. But we are fortunate in having an unlimited amount of space for harbor purposes and water-front manufacture. Twelve miles from the Chesapeake Bay to Baltimore one can find innumerable places suitable for factories with water frontage. In this area and with the number of rivers and harbors entering the bay we can accommodate any quantity of business, so that we must look not only to the present as the great commercial and business welfare of Baltimore, but we must look to the future when much of the water-borne commerce of the Nation must be carried through the port of Baltimore. If the ports become so very congested that it will be absolutely impossible to accommodate them they can make use of this wonderful location we have for manufactures, shipbuilding, and various enterprises which should be along a water front.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I wanted to say a year ago I voted for the elimination of these Subtreasuries under the understanding that when we passed the Federal reserve act that the Federal Reserve System was to take care of the work that they were doing. I had a good deal of protest from Cincinnati for having thus voted, and I am still concerned about whether there is any real need of a Subtreasury with the branch-bank system in vogue.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The branch-bank system legislation has not been passed which gave them the work of the Subtreasuries. It may be all right when the proper legislation is passed and when we have authorized this branch-bank system, but I do not think we ought to put these institutions into effect pending the trial of the branch-bank system and until the proper legislation is passed.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman from Ohio will procure the report from the Bureau of Efficiency, provided for in the last legislative bill, he will find the reason why they all ought to be abolished.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is the opinion of the Bureau of Efficiency, but if that bureau had gone to Baltimore and saw how this institution is connected with all the financial institutions of Baltimore and what a great service is being performed, they would think that the sum of \$31,500 for the amount of work done is very small indeed.

Mr. COX. The gentleman would not think that the banks of Baltimore are entitled to preference over the banks of Pittsburgh or Richmond?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Every city in the land as large as Baltimore has a Federal reserve bank in it and Baltimore has none.

And, moreover, when they opened a branch bank they went to Richmond to get the president, although we have a man in Baltimore who was president of the Federal reserve bank in Richmond, and made it the most successful reserve bank of the whole country. I do not want to say that he wanted this position, because he did not, inasmuch as he resigned from the

one in Richmond. But I merely state that to show we have men who can take the presidency of this institution. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland makes a similar request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] moves that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10358) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### USELESS PAPERS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a report by Mr. TALBOTT (H. Rept. 351) from the Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, which was ordered printed and filed.

#### RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors I desire to report the river and harbor bill (H. R. 10069, H. Rept. 350), and I also submit minority views of a member of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], and ask that they also be printed; but the minority views are to be printed separately.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina reports the river and harbor bill, together with his report and the report of the minority, which are to be printed separately.

The bill was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, March 2, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. CRAGO, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 667) for the relief of Jeremiah Stover, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 347), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3090) for the relief of Clement H. Cole, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 348), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2492) to establish the military record of Marshall M. Pool, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 349), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 10365) granting the consent of Congress to the Forsyth special road district of Taney County, Mo., to construct a bridge across White River at Forsyth, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 10366) to authorize the adoption, registration, and protection of a national trade-mark to

distinguish merchandise manufactured or produced in the United States of America and used in commerce with foreign nations, or among the several States, or with Indian tribes, and to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to license the use of same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 10367) to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a minimum wage board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and to provide penalties for violation of this act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 10368) to promote the health and efficiency of the firemen of the District of Columbia by providing a double platoon system in the fire department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WALTON: A bill (H. R. 10369) for the relief and civilization of the Pueblo Indians located in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 10370) providing pensions at the rate of \$32, \$35, \$38, and \$40 per month for certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War according to age and service; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 10371) to establish a bureau for the study of criminal, pauper, and defective classes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: Resolution (H. Res. 262) providing for the immediate consideration of House bill 10022; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10372) granting a pension to Phillip Stokes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 10373) for the relief of Jacob L. Malsberry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 10374) granting a pension to Mary E. Croasman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 10375) granting an increase of pension to Michael Nye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 10376) granting a pension to Cynthia L. Anthony; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10377) for the relief of Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLETT: A bill (H. R. 10378) granting an increase of pension to John W. Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 10379) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Hughie S. Hemingway captain of Coast Artillery Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 10380) granting an increase of pension to Feracane Paolo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEATING: A bill (H. R. 10381) granting a pension to Peter O. Gaynor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: A bill (H. R. 10382) granting an increase of pension to John H. Nickerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 10383) granting an increase of pension to William D. Dunkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 10384) granting an increase of pension to Foster D. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBBINS: A bill (H. R. 10385) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 10386) granting a pension to Julia Agnes Held; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 10387) granting an increase of pension to Jeannie Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 10388) granting an increase of pension to Peter Jacoby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10389) granting a pension to W. G. Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 10390) granting a pension to Sarah Feely; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10391) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Hearing; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 10392) granting an increase of pension to John M. Curtis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10393) granting an increase of pension to John L. Bryan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Mrs. Jennie D. Wilson, Wichita, Kans., asking that investigation be made of failure to arrest and prosecute a gang operating an extortion, white-slavery, blackmailing scheme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Gertrude Hinske and 29 other citizens of Sheboygan, Wis., asking for an appropriation for Federal maintenance of the kindergarten division in the Bureau of Education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions of Peripatetic Club and the Emerson Co., of New York, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Loyal Order of Moose of the World, favoring passage of H. R. 7364, a bill to reincorporate the Loyal Order of Moose in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Keystone Branch No. 157, National Association of Letter Carriers, Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of H. R. 9414, proposing increased compensation for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of Miley Brook, William S. Mahan, and 12 others, asking for increase of pensions to soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: Memorial of the Audubon Society of Missouri, favoring Senate bill 1553; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the following insurance men of St. Louis, Mo.: J. W. Estes, representing the Aetna Life Insurance Co.; John D. Lively, representing Royal Union Mutual Life; George Barnes, representing Home Life Insurance Co.; F. T. Rench, representing the National Life Insurance Co.; W. G. Fatherly, representing the Equitable Life Assurance Society; George E. Black, representing the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.; Eugene L. Isaacs, of the Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa; S. L. Morton, of the Connecticut Mutual Life Insurance Co.; and J. M. Bloodworth, of the Fidelity Mutual Insurance Co., favoring an amendment to the Pomerene bill, allowing the deduction of business insurance from income of corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Speckart Bros. Drug Co., Roland A. Grosse, Henry Gruber, and Otto Frank Cejka, all of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the Edmonds bill, providing for a pharmaceutical corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Bernard J. Otting, president of St. Louis University, favoring the use of more chaplains in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. M. McLarin, president of the National Federation of Federal Employees, protesting against the Borland eight-hour amendment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Stella D. Neun and four other employees of P. F. Collier & Son, urging the repeal of the zonal postage arrangements for second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Liventeish Century Club, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Association and others, relative to maintaining present jurisdiction of Interstate Commerce Commission over rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Council of Farmers' Cooperative Association, favoring the retaining jurisdiction over rates by the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 68 citizens of Ottawa, Ill., asking legislation to prohibit the use of grain in the manufacture of intoxicating liquors during the period of the war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Papers to accompany H. R. 10380, granting an increase of pension to Feracane Paolo; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Yula Scott and A. Lind, of Denver, Colo., praying for the repeal of that section of the war-revenue act providing for increased postage rates on periodicals: to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., against House bill 9248, relative to real estate values and rentals in Washington; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the commander of General S. M. B. Youngs Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring pension for widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of employees of monotype section of Government Printing Office, asking increase in pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Surry Lumber Co., against proposed eight-hour law for laborers; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Charles Bagley, of Harford Medical Association, favoring passage of House bill 9563, relative to officers in Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of maritime committee of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, favoring passage of House bill 7913, relative to Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Thomas S. Cullen, Charles W. Soper, and J. F. Soper, all of Maryland, against increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the railroad men of Minnesota, by W. W. Royster, chairman Minnesota legislative board, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, favoring no time limit to return the railroads to private ownership; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, petition of the Minneapolis terminal clerks, by Edwin Boutwell, petitioning Congress to pass House bill 3831, having for its object the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Clima Western Oil Co., asking Congress to leave power with the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate rates; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. SNOOK: Memorial of 40 postal employees of Defiance County, Ohio, favoring increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of the board of directors of the Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring the passage of the Dyer bill (H. R. 9563) fixing the grades of the commissioned officers of the Medical Corps and of the Medical Reserve Corps of the United States Army on active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Grand Junction, Colo., favoring passage of the chaplains bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

SATURDAY, March 2, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in time of our national peril we think most of the spiritual qualities of our men, and we look to Thee for that divine ministry that can heighten, refine, and glorify the qualities of manhood that are consecrated to the highest ideals of a Christian civilization. Grant that in this Senate and in all the departments of Government we may hold as our most sacred trust those high ideals of hearts that love God and love humanity and that work together for the establishment of Thy truth among men. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gerry	Lewis	Nugent
Beckham	Gronna	Lodge	Overman
Borah	Hale	McCumber	Owen
Brandegge	Henderson	McKellar	Page
Colt	Hollis	McLean	Pittman
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	McNary	Poindestor
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Martin	Ransdell
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Nelson	Reed
Fletcher	Kendrick	New	Saulsbury
Gallinger	Kirby	Norris	Shafroth

Sheppard	Smith, Mich.	Sutherland	Vardaman
Sherman	Smith, S. C.	Thompson	Wadsworth
Shields	Smoot	Tillman	Wolcott
Simmons	Sterling	Trammell	
Smith, Ga.	Stone	Underwood	

Mr. McNARY. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness in his family.

Mr. NORRIS. I desire to announce the absence of the Senators from Iowa, who are in attendance upon the funeral of the wife of the senior Senator from that State.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent owing to illness.

Mr. ASHURST. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], is absent by reason of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] on official business. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BECKHAM. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JAMES] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. HOLLIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is necessarily absent. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

### RAILROAD CONTROL—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I ask that two additional members of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes, be appointed on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and names as additional conferees on the part of the Senate the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] and the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 92) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries within the former Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9903. An act to provide for restoration to their former grades of enlisted men discharged to accept commissions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9571. An act to authorize the appointment of officers of the Philippine Scouts as officers in the militia or other locally created armed forces of the Philippine Islands drafted into the service of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10027. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, a telegram was submitted yesterday by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and some comments were made on it by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. It had to do with the matter of shipments of fruits and vegetables. I have received somewhat similar telegrams bearing on the same subject, and I submit one and ask to have it printed in the RECORD. There seems to be an ample production of vegetables and that sort of thing, but the difficulty seems to be to get them to market. I present this telegram as an illustration of those I am getting on the subject, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. D. U. FLETCHER,  
Washington, D. C.:  
LEESBURG, FLA., March 1, 1918.

The South has been urged to grow foodstuff. We have answered the call and now have plenty of early vegetables, lettuce, cabbage, etc., which have been produced at great expense for fertilizer, seed, and labor. On account of slow transportation these perishable goods arrive at destination practically worthless, taking from 9 to 15 days from here